

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF THE
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1872.

ARTICLE I.

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE GREAT LUTHERAN REFORMATION,
ACCORDING TO DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THE-
OLOGY.

By S. SPRECHER, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.

The author of this book is distinguished even among the great men of Germany for his acute understanding and his great speculative power. He belongs to the school of evangelical divines, and is a representative of the modern evangelical theology which is fighting the battle of evangelical truth with skepticism on scientific grounds. He is one of the class of theologians who are sometimes called Mediating divines, as they stand between a blind authority, on the one hand, and an unbelieving rationalism on the other, maintaining the great system of evangelical truth by exhibiting its relations to the capacities and wants of the human mind.

The book itself has an originality, a freshness and a depth of truth, which have the charm of novelty, as well as the claim of science. It fascinates and enriches the studious reader, giving him such satisfaction and light in respect to the great Reformation of the sixteenth century and its uni-

versal bearings, as are seldom afforded by a book of its size. It is a great spiritual drama, exhibiting the inner nature and connection of the most fundamental divine truths and the most important human interests, in a manner intensely interesting to every earnest mind. Especially is that part of the work which discusses the History of the Theology of the Lutheran Reformation interesting and important to our Church at this day and in this country. In the exhibition of the Pre-Reformation ecclesiastical condition, in the narrative of the conflict of the principle of the Reformation with Romanism and superstition on the one hand, and with fanaticism and infidelity on the other, as well as in the description of the grand results for all human interests in science and morals, in the family and the state, in the Church and religion—we see a masterly exposition of the principles involved in what are to us the great life-questions of the present time. Sensible of this, and finding that this part of the book has an inherent unity and a distinct sphere, we prepared a translation of it; the author gave his sanction to its publication in that form; and our Board of Publication adopted the manuscript. Having afterwards abandoned this design, we would still—for the benefit of those who may not be able to gain access to the book, and as an inducement to others to procure the translation of the entire work lately published—give a synoptic view of this part of it, following the author as he traces the evangelical principle in its early incipency, its later development, and its full culmination in the Augsburg Confession. We will in this article attempt a sketch of the preparation of the principle of the Lutheran Reformation, and in another number, a survey of the agency of Luther and Melancthon in the effectual development and application of it.

In discussing what he calls the negative aspect of this preparation, the author fully recognizes the service which the Catholic Church—even when under the papacy—rendered to the cause of humanity and civilization. It educated the nations which now bear the destinies of the world. It led them, in the days of their barbarism, to realize something

higher than mere temporal power and brute force. It instilled into them—and with better right and more success than ever did the old political empire—the idea of universality; opposing as it did an all-embracing spiritual kingdom, based upon the oneness of humanity in Christ, to the separation of the races and the enmity of the nations.

In its conception of Christianity, the Western was also in advance of the Eastern Church, where the interest in Christianity was mainly an intellectual one, restricted to the pure doctrine and the enlightenment which it confers. At first this intellectualism of the East was of a speculative, spontaneous, productive character, as is seen in the Greek monachism and its literary productions; but, at a later period, the speculative and productive impulse subsided, and though the intellectual tendency remained, it manifested itself in the educated classes, only in a formal employment of the understanding without theological reproductiveness; and in the general masses, in a merely passive receptive manner, inasmuch as they no longer looked for salvation in the knowledge of the truth, but the appropriation through the memory of traditional formulæ; these constantly becoming, more and more, merely dead mysteries, nay, as is wont to happen, losing their original meaning and spirit, and giving place to gross representations and superstitious abuses. The Western Church had a more practical tendency; it sought for Christianity another than a mere ideal existence, and thus represents an essentially higher stage of the penetration of the gospel into the spirit of man, namely, its passage from the intellect into the will.

But it led to erroneous conceptions of the gospel, and to corruptions of the ecclesiastical and Christian life. First, it changed the Christian idea of the one universal Church from that of a rich many-membered unity of mankind, in which the world becomes a living temple of God, and humanity the body of Christ with many members, into that of a formal, superficial, empty uniformity. It substituted for the Christian bond of union, which is an inner one—namely, the Holy Spirit, who dwelling in the heart, places all in immediate

communion with Christ, the head—an external one—a mere outer law imposed by force.

The higher life, which Christianity imparts, is a life of redemption from all the spiritual evils which burden mankind not yet in Christ; it is a deliverance of the heart from the oppressive sense of guilt, that is, it is reconciliation with God. But the consequence of the hierarchical ideas is to take from the unclerical masses all the means of reconciliation, and to limit the possession of them to the clergy. Thus no one can be reconciled to God, unless he is, first of all, united and reconciled with the Church. The layman is never to come into conscious communion with God himself. And the benefit which the Church dispenses is not a benefit of personal fellowship with God; but, being rather only of a material kind, becomes an impersonal matter. He is led into all kinds of superstitious reliance upon sensible things, relics, holy water, &c., and—as even the dumbest conscience cannot seek salvation with full confidence in such external, magical grace—into the practice of all kinds of supposed meritorious performances, in the way of doing and suffering, to which, as good works, an atoning merit is supposed to belong.

The higher life of Christianity is the deliverance of the will from the power of sin, or a life of holiness and love. But the idea of the holiness acknowledged by her to be an attribute of the Church, became, in her opposition to Novatianism, and especially to Donatism, dissociated, more and more, from that of the moral holiness of the individual person, and gradually changed into the notion that the Church possesses holiness by means of the sacraments—in the last instance, the sacrament of sacraments—ordination. The ordained and ordaining clergy is the point of the earthly christendom with which the Holy Spirit is inseparably connected and from which he never departs. They dispense all his gifts and graces. Men are holy just so far as they are connected, in obedience, with them. The result was a blinding ambition in the hierarchical rulers, turning the object of Christian love, in the conquest of the world for Christ, into ecclesiastical and worldly ends; and opposed to this, an ascetic Monasticism,

in those more anxious about their personal salvation, leading them to neglect the great commission to labor for the conversion of the world to Christ, and turning their piety into a fear and love of God which was marred by spiritual selfishness.

The higher life of Christianity, finally, is the deliverance of the mind from darkness and error in divine things, and a life of light through divine illumination. But the hierarchical Church infringed upon the Christian blessing of illumination. Even in the Oriental Church, the episcopate had come gradually to be regarded as being with divine doctrinal authority the infallible bearer of the Christian truth. The right to interpret the Scriptures had been, more and more, transferred to the bishop, and though it was admitted that individual bishops, yea, provincial synods, might err, yet, as entire Christendom, which was supposed to be represented in the episcopate, could not be liable to error and apostacy, the declarations of œcumenical synods were deemed infallible. But the Occidental Church, in which the idea of the one Church, as the humanity governed by the Christian law, became the central point—wrought out the hierarchy in new directions. The law, in order to be equal to the new necessities and questions constantly arising, needs a continuous legislative as well as executive activity. To accord to the truth itself the power, in any case, to produce conviction, distinct from that ascribed to the Church, would be to place the truth above the Church, and to acknowledge in the subject having access to it, a relative independence. But this would overthrow the entire edifice of internal authority. The answer to every question must be given by the Church; but as any individual bishop may err, and synods are not always at hand to give new answers to new questions, the question arises where is the infallible Church? How shall we find it and hear it, unless it be discernible and visible? In order to be so, it must have a permanent, and not, like the episcopal assemblies, a merely temporary seat upon earth. Therefore the Church of Rome, together with the successor of the apostle Peter, is appointed to be the visible place and refuge of the

truth. Here the true Church has immovable visibility; from this Chair the Holy Spirit never departs; whoever remains in obedience to it, and in connection with its decisions, is secure against falling from the truth. To this culmination of the hierarchical pyramid, this fundamental tendency pressed irresistibly onward. For if the Church be once regarded mainly as a spiritual kingdom, then does the unity of the Church irresistibly demand, that the kingly power, perpetuated by her, should be exercised in the most perfect, consequently the most united form, that is, in the form of a spiritual monarchy. If instead of the communion of the members with the head of the Church through the Holy Spirit, the administration of government and obedience to the life-regulations of the Church be the principal objects to be desired, then certainly the power should remain undivided, and in a single hand. In the ecclesiasticism thus degenerate, and fixed, as it was, upon a false, formal, and spiritually impoverished unity, there was, consequently, a natural necessity, an irresistible tendency to the fulfilment of its destiny, in seeing the incorporation of the idea of the universal Church in the sensible visibility and oneness of an appointed place and of an episcopal chair. Such was the fate of the grand idea of the catholicity, the universality of the Church, which had accorded to all branches of the Church their distinct independence, because the one universal Church lives in all. Thus did it end its career, after having, for the last time, made itself felt, in the Reforming Synods of the fifteenth century. We see it there, at the close of the development, contracted and changed into a sensible particularity, which claims to be the true essence of the Catholic Church, and seeks to deprive of personal independent life everything external to itself. The Romish Church—this single one—is held to be identical with the Church universal, to be the source and power of the whole; this single member claims to be the universal! The belief became prevalent that Rome is the hinge and head, the foundation and law, and even the principle of all churches (*Roma cardo et caput omnium ecclesiarum, fundamentum et forma, a qua omnes ecclesiæ principium sumpserunt*).

The Mediæval idea of the Church and the hierarchy, culminating in the papacy, was to be realized by the elevation of the papacy over the episcopal college to the state of absolute monarchy; and by achieving the so-called ecclesiastical independence, over against the state. The papacy had derived its existence from the episcopate, nay, it was dependent upon it, at each new papal election. But the effort to represent the papacy as the principle of all church-ordinances, as the fountain of all episcopal authority; as an imperishable entity; as simultaneously sustaining itself and everything else, dependent only upon its own life-law—was by no means fruitless. It operated in various ways until at length it was declared, on the part of the popes, that the bishops are called only to association in the cure, but not in the supremacy of power (in partem sollicitudinis non in plenitudinem potestatis). For the essential co-ordination of bishops handed down from antiquity, in which the bishop of Rome was regarded only as first among equals, was substituted a subordination; and it was denied on the part of the curialistic system that the episcopate, like the papacy, received plenipotentiary authority immediately from Christ. The one Church is no longer a band either of co-ordinate free congregations, or of confederate episcopal dioceses, but an absolute spiritual monarchy, in which the bishops are merely an advisory aristocracy.

In the struggle for independence and supremacy with the state, the latter could plead, that if the Old Testament theocracy, which had been commended to the nations by the Church as a pattern, had a king, and not a priest, at its head, then could the Christian emperor properly regard himself as the successor of King David. But the hierarchy, on the other hand, could plead that all nations were given to the Church, and to no emperor; that it is hers to represent the higher, the spiritual; that the title of the emperor to dominion, resting only, as it does, upon his succession to the old Roman empire, had originated in heathenism, and could receive the higher consecration only through the acknowledged papal coronation. Amid all the struggles for suprem-

acy, the idea of the papal superiority was deeply impressed upon the Christian world. In the firmament of the universal Church, it was said, there are two high dignities ordained of God; the higher, for the government of souls, the lower, for the government of bodies; the papal and the kingly powers, related to each other like the sun and moon; and like the symbols also in this, that the latter derives its splendor from the former. Peter is the vicegerent of Him whose is the earth and all the fulness thereof. The Lord has committed to Peter, for government, not only the whole Church, but the whole world. In addition to this divine vocation of the papacy to world-dominion, must yet be considered the presumed ignobleness of the origin of the kingly power. It was wrested in the Old Testament only by human wilfulness, established *per extorsionem humanam*; for the most part, its origin is craft or violence; it can be partaker of divine authority, only through the consecration of the Church. There can be but one supreme source of power on earth. The world, having been once committed by Christ to the Church, cannot be, a second time, given by him immediately to another. Though Peter did not immediately assume this sole regency, he does now enter upon it, in virtue of a divine right which has not been affected by the passage of years. In these contests for supremacy the papacy became corrupt in proportion to its success, until it was at last so perverted that whoever involved himself with its machinery, even though with the purpose of reforming it, was inevitably carried away with it. Even Møhler himself acknowledges that, for some time before the Reformation, the papal chair was occupied by men whom hell has devoured.

In tracing the development of church-doctrine, in respect to its form and its subject-matter, its primal sources and the fundamental view determining the dogma, we notice the same dualism which was manifest in the development of the ecclesiastical system between the ruling and the subject classes. This appears formally in its ideal aspect in the *conflict between faith and knowledge*. The ecclesiastical dogma claiming for itself unconditional authority, is neither able

nor willing to be reconciled to the demand for personal certainty. There is thus formed an antagonism between the intelligent mind longing for certainty, and the dark power of tradition demanding blind submission. This dualism scholasticism tried, at first, to overcome. Thus Anselm placed faith, that is the reception of the objective ecclesiastical doctrine, in the foreground, with the assurance that the cognition of its truth would subsequently come, as the result of experience. His formula is: I believe that I may know (*credo ut intelligam*). Of a possible antagonism between this experience or the knowledge attainable through it, and the ecclesiastical doctrine, he has no suspicion. Nor does he inquire whether that reception must occur consciously and as a recognized duty, or blindly. For he proceeds from the standpoint of the piety, unshaken and undisturbed by doubt, of a man in the nonage of Christianity, but who, from his youth up, has belonged to the Church, and who has been kept *morally* in this piety. The case in which this piety cannot yet be, as with the non-Christian; or where it is no more, as with the skeptic—he does not examine. Abelard, on the other hand, thinks it necessary first of all, to *know* what is to be believed, and he reverses the formula of Anselm, saying: I know that I may believe (*intelligo ut credam*). But a faith which receives only what is proved to be true, is nothing but the consciousness of the evidence of that which has been proved—that feeling of certainty which of itself accompanies the normal process of knowledge, and which has as yet, so far as itself is concerned, nothing to do with the religious feeling and life. The consciousness of certainty or evidence is, according to Anselm, produced by an *ethico-religious* experience; according to Abelard, by a purely *intellectual* process. As certainty is to Abelard altogether of an intellectual nature, and not at all of a religious kind, he allows to experience no essential place in the attainment of personal certainty of the truth of Christianity. The effect of experience, and the action of the will, are ignored. According to his principle, Christian truth would have to be demonstrable by reason,

and, consequently, as Christianity would exist already in the universal reason, it would not be indispensable. He was properly rejected by the Church, but without an answer to the question how can others than those yet in nonage, enter simply *in a moral way* into a blind subjection to the subject-matter of ecclesiastical doctrine on the ground of the authority of the Church?

Fearful of this question, the later Scholasticism based itself entirely upon the authority of the Church, as the sole supreme authority; and it labored only in single points, to expound more fully, to define more clearly, or to reconcile more completely the ecclesiastical doctrine to the thinking mind; as is done especially by Thomas Aquinas. In its most flourishing period, Scholasticism felt itself so completely at one with the Church, that it became a main support of the entire ecclesiastical structure; limiting itself to the work of analyzing, harmonizing, and systematizing the collected material of the ecclesiastical dogmas. Theology, it was said, is the positive science. She enjoys supernatural sources. She, as the mistress, must claim to rule; philosophy, as the handmaiden, must submit to serve. But the very restriction, which this involved, of the use of reason to a purely formal exercise upon positive dogmas, entailed peculiar dangers. Through the passion, which it thus cherished, for dialectics, Scholasticism lost itself in endless distinctions and subtleties. A cold, frivolous understanding handled the holiest objects with a spirit destitute of all inner interest in them. Thus it broke, at length, with actual life; and this turned away from it partly into mysticism, partly into skepticism.

Duns Scotus makes the last attempt to support the most absolute ecclesiastical positivism, by introducing, as its speculative basis, the omnipotent power and absolute freedom of God. He denies that anything is in itself true and good; declares that only that must be regarded as true and good which God actually wills to have so regarded. Of this actual will of God the Church has the authentic record; and as there is not attainable on objective grounds any personal certainty of anything as in itself true and good, she is to be un-

conditionally believed. But such a basing of an unconditional faith of authority upon arbitrariness as the highest, and, in the end, the all-controlling principle is, already, inwardly an absolute skepticism—a doubting of the fixedness, necessity, and attainableness of truth in general—a confession that the ecclesiastical doctrine does not grow into union with the mind; that it is, for it, only something outward, accidental, that is, it is the admission that the body of the Church-doctrine is antecedently foreign to the Spirit—a difficulty that is not removed by the declaration that the relation cannot, and shall not, be any other than a dualistic one.

As the Church, in the absence of the evangelical principle, knew neither how to guide this nascent consciousness, nor how to relieve this need for truth and certainty, she was filled with indifference and doubt. With those faithful to her authority, there arose indifference toward the truth of the subject-matter of dogmas which were not supposed to have any inherent force of conviction, nor so far forth, value in themselves; but to be dependent solely upon the authority of the Church. With those not so submissive, there arose doubt in regard to the ecclesiastical doctrines. The knowing, says Occam, knows only the phenomenal; that which transcends this, is only for faith. There is no philosophy of the divine; and theology, which alone is cognizant of God, rests entirely upon the authority of the Church. But even in theology there is no unity or necessity. All commands of God are arbitrary; such is the nature even of the command to love him. Occam delights to isolate the free might-perfection of God from his love and wisdom, and so to emphasize omnipotence as to bring all firm conceptions into a state of wavering. The supernatural as a source of miracles, is represented, by him, as not only transcending, but as contradicting all rational conceptions, as arbitrarily playing with the entire natural and logical world. This he carries out with—what appears to us—a frivolous zest. He finds it probable, for example, according to the doctrine of the communication of the divine attributes to the human nature of Christ, that the

head of Christ may be also his hand, and his hand also his eye. Whether he drew these consequences from the principle of pure authority, in sincere submission to the authority of the Church, or in the way of irony, is disputed. However this may be, it is certain that for him and his school, even the existence of God is only probable. Probabilism began to eat away the moral consciousness of many. The end of the Middle Age manifests a declension, consequently, in the moral life, not only of the papal court and of Monasticism, but in the life of the consciousness itself. The dualism of the dogma agreeing with authority and the spirit seeking certainty, present from the beginning, concealed, but not overcome, constantly broke forth more and more openly, and manifested itself by a thousand signs, especially in Italy, the seat of the papacy. There the heathen nature, softened by the cultivation of the beautiful, and especially by the forms of the antique world, or more correctly, awakened, as if galvanically, to the mere resemblance of a new and flourishing life, seated itself upon the throne, and began to treat Christianity as a mere fable, which is profitable to the high, and suitable to the lowly in life.

The same dualism is to be noticed in the *subject-matter of the doctrine* reared upon the divine authority of the Romish Church. Thus the prevalent doctrine of the Middle Age with regard to the *original condition* of man, does not suffer righteousness and holiness to be regarded as belonging to the idea of his proper nature in virtue of his appointed constitution, but as something conferred on him as a superadded gift. Consequently when lost, this gift could become again externally the property of man; help could come to him in an entirely external way; the lost holiness could be restored without any participation of the person himself in an inward regeneration and in a complete conversion of the will, that is, in a magical way—just as magically, as the supernatural gift became the property of the first man in his original condition, as an accidental addition to his nature. This was supposed to occur in baptism. But as all fall again after baptism, all become sub-

ject to the penances and works prescribed by the Church—to the sacrifice of penance, to penitence, confession, satisfaction, and all works deemed necessary to secure restoration.

And so in the question of the relation of divine *grace* to human *freedom*. Grace is so defined that, when and as far as it operates, human freedom is suspended; and human freedom is so apprehended that, when and as it operates, it, instead of grace, can have merit according to congruity (ex congruo), or even according to worthiness (ex condigno). But a grace which, so far as it extends, instead of using freedom for its own self-commination, binds or excludes it, is *magical*; and a freedom which, so far as it exists, supersedes grace and depends upon itself, is Pelagian. Apprehended thus, as exclusive of each other, the one must be sacrificed to the other. But this logical consequence being necessarily inconsistent with either the moral or the religious interest, a compromise is attempted by a commingling of magical and Pelagian elements in the apprehension of the church-doctrine. The scholastic systems of Thomas and Duns Scotus, which, at least, through the stream issuing from them, controlled the public doctrine from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, are both such combinations of grace and freedom, with the preponderance of the former in Thomas, and of the latter in Scotus. The Thomist system emphasizing grace more, yet lets it be so given over and bound to the Church, that she becomes the Vicar of God, and grace her servant; thus founding precisely that false independence of the Christian humanity, over against God, which is the fundamental essence of Pelagianism. The Scotist system, although starting from the freedom of man, yet gives room for the magical, in the doctrine that the lack of power for self-deliverance which is present in the individual, exists not in the true humanity, that is, the Church; God being supposed to have abdicated, in her behalf, the divine powers of salvation, or to have conferred upon her the supreme power of releasing from sin and saving the soul. Thus has she now, in the holy sacrifice of the mass, in the absolution, and in the indulgence, power over God himself. If, accordingly, Scotus did not maintain the

self-deliverance of the individual—for this subjective Pelagianism had long before been condemned as too manifestly depriving Christianity of its value—yet he held fast by a self-redemption of the Christian humanity, or an objective Pelagianism. The inclination of the human heart to centre in itself, to feel satisfied without the sense of perpetual dependence on God—the imagination of being possessed of divine powers in one's self which leads the natural man, in forgetfulness of God, to trust immediately in his own unaided powers, and which is the irreligious root of all Pelagianism and unbelief—is here hid under the veil of superstition. And as this system promoted the glorification of the Church, her saints and her inexhaustible treasure of power and grace, it received the liveliest approbation. Such repression of God and Christ, as well as of communion with God behind communion with the Church, was regarded as especially pious, as exalted far above the ordinary form of piety which would not direct the glow of its devotion so entirely to Mary and the saints. Thus was there an anthropocentrical apotheosis of the Church, slightly veiled by the idea, that the saints, with Mary at their head, and the angels, constitute the ideal, the celestial part of the Church. But the celestial—the ideal Church is apprehended as so closely connected with the terrestrial—the Romish, in the unity of *corpus mysticum Christi*, that the terrestrial congregation, through prayer for its intercessions, and by means of sacrifices, has power over the celestial; and thus, to induce Mary and the saints to operate determinately upon the Father and the Son. Thus has the terrestrial Church come to be the vicegerent of God; and as all this is predicated of the Romish Church, she has, during the earthly world-period, (the period between the present and the day of Judgment inclusive of Purgatory), taken the place of God. With him men come not into communion, but only with that divine order of the world, which is the Church. Thus does she appear as if she were another God (an *alter Deus*). God and Christ have retired into the distance—into transcendence—to appear again only at the final consummation for the judgment of the world.

The result could be only superstition and unbelief. In this superstition the Church created for herself all kinds of surrogates or substitutes for the truly and vitally divine. The sacraments work *ex opere operato*; they require only the minimum of the human act of freedom—the non-interposition of an obstruction (*non ponere obicem*). Low Mass works in the distance without the knowledge of those for whom it is said—works even in the under-world. The Church undertakes the case of individual souls, even of the departed, before God. The consequence was inward emptiness and spiritual death. The masses, sunk in superstition, followed tradition and the usages prescribed by devotees of the Church; the frivolous becoming deluded, by false hopes, and the serious robbed of all consolation, because deprived of all certainty of the forgiveness of sin. For them the confessional became a rack and a torture to conscience, as they could never know whether they had not confessed too little, and therefore vitiated the absolution. On the other hand, as emancipation from purgatory and entrance into heaven were made dependent upon the force and number of intercessions and masses for souls which could be bought with money—men of sense, well knowing that the difference between the rich and the poor existing in this world, could not extend into the next, lost all confidence in this mercenary priestly grace, and were filled with a contempt which, in the absence of anything better, was often turned into frivolity and unbelief. The centres of intelligence—Rome especially—were cankered with unbelief. While the stupid multitude turned the Lord's prayer, which had been given to prevent heathenish repetitions, into a *Paternoster*; prayed its rosary, pursued pilgrimages, ran after venders of indulgences, made sacrifices of money, and even submitted to the severest mortifications for the appeasing of inner disquiet—there were not wanting in Rome those who said, "This fable of Christ has brought us great gain," or those who, on hearing of Melancthon's belief in eternal life and future judgment, said they would esteem him a more sensible man, if he did not believe such things.

Even Bellarmine acknowledges, that for some years before

the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, there was no strictness in spiritual courts, no chastity in manners, no reverence for the sanctuary, no scholarship, in short, almost no religion. Even amongst the people, scorn and hatred of every thing that was called priest or monk were already diffused.

The character demanded of the new knowledge, which was to check this delusion and corruption, may be gathered from the great wants thus fully manifest. It must consist in bringing the gospel, which had once before been the preserving salt against the incipient putrefaction of the world, once more, in all its primitive purity, power and leavening influence, into the mind and life of the people. For theology, it was necessary that the saving truth of Christianity should be held, indeed, in its integrity, yea, that, by a return to its sources, it should again be brought before the eye, in its primitive and independent lustre. Only in this way could those merely formal tendencies which had diverged from the ethical and religious spirit, and, consequently, to an indifferent, cold, skeptical dialecticism—be destroyed. But, in addition to this, it was necessary that saving truth should not continue to be a mere outward authority, and, consequently, at last, dependent again upon the authority of the Church; but that the way should be clearly pointed out in which it implants itself in the innermost knowing and willing of the mind. Thus, and only thus, could the awakened susceptibility fill itself with its ethico-religious and uncorrupted content, and not only recover from that disordered state, but rise to a higher stage of self-conscious evangelical freedom.

Such a positive preparation of the Reformation there was in progress. Among the positive, conservative, and progressive powers, the principal are: first, mysticism and the mystical theology; secondly, the return to the Holy Scriptures; thirdly, the education of the people. But these factors are not all at once present; and where they are found together, they are at first coy toward each other. In the combination of them, the Reformation-principle first finds its inner ripeness, its truly ecclesiastical and rejuvenating power and form.

In their union, this principle, for the first time, becomes equal to all attacks; for then it combines in covenant bonds all powers truly capable of life. Among all these it is mysticism which sustains here the relation of the budding axillary leaf to the plant. It was not, as some moderns think, merely a species of philosophy, or merely an initiatory step toward a new speculative mode of thought, which, at variance with its own time, retired into itself, in order to find within itself all truth and reality. In such an anthropologism no actual communion with a personal God is sought; while mysticism places its entire essence in such divine communion. The religious is to be regarded as the primitive element—the life-germ of mysticism.

But if Romanism tended to separate the outer, the historical, from the inner, the spiritual, Mysticism tended to reverse the process. All true piety has an innate tendency to the historical; and it is impossible to distinguish in the purely inner sphere what may be merely human movement, from that which springs from God's Spirit, without an historical standard. The mystic did right in refusing to be satisfied without real inner communion with God; but in separating himself from the corrective afforded by historical Christianity, and in neglecting the outward means of spiritual culture, he was in danger of losing his faith in the personality of God, as well as the true idea of his relations to the prevenient grace of God in Christ. In its most advanced stage, during its isolation from the external Church, Mysticism was still involved with all kinds of work-righteousness—with efforts through divine resignation to dispose itself for grace—with the idea that this resignation, when, and as far as it is present, is participant of divine grace and salvation—thus making peace solely dependent upon the amount of virtue. There was, upon the whole, much said by it about self-negation and self-emptying, but almost nothing about the positive and free apprehension of grace, and as little about the negative condition of this apprehension—about the renunciation of confidence in our own righteousness—even the mystical

righteousness. Overleaping this middle member, namely *faith*, there was an immediate transition from divine resignation to deification—to mystical enjoyment of God. Humility as the divesting of oneself of the creature, was powerfully inculcated; but even where it gained a stricter ethical content, and received the denial of every thing selfish as its distinctive spirit, it still remained all the more, with the notion: *First*, purification from all that is ungodly; *Then*, communion with God. But therein is involved also this other notion: Before divine sanctification no communion is possible; and thus would this be unattainable upon earth: God must have communion even with the sinner who is to be saved—of course with the sinner who, though unholy, does, at least, acknowledge his guilt and his desert of punishment. Yea, we should have to say that it is only when the soul acknowledges its desert of punishment, its separation from God through unatoned-for guilt; and instead of dreaming of immediate deification, glorifies the righteousness of God, and, first of all, seeks reconciliation with him—that it possesses any true and pure humility. This anticipatory character of mysticism was, consequently, punished with constant alternation between exulting joy and painful discomfort, perpetual wavering between momentary elevation in mystical happiness and frequent despondency in earthly misery. It had not yet found that page in the book of the perduring consciousness of sin, upon which constant consolation is compatible with the presence of sin, because the sting of sin is recognized as removed by the communion with the reconciler, who is perfectly equal to the sin. It is, indeed, the essential function of Christian faith to apprehend the blotting out of guilt, notwithstanding the (constantly resisted) continuance of the sinfulness. Mysticism, in common with the Church of its day, was ignorant of this distinction between guilt and sin, and of the practicability of the extinction of guilt without the immediate extinction of sin. It dreamed now of an overwhelming happiness, which it regarded as the extinction of all sin—deification; then again having a return of the sense of the continuance of sin, it knew not how to

enjoy the extinction of guilt—reconciliation with God. Yet was there in its emphasizing of the sufferings of Christ—of the sorrow of his love, an open way to the true conception which was pursued by other precursors of the Reformation. Especially was this done, as we shall soon see, by John Wes-sel, with whom, in the place of the divine resignation, on the one hand, and of the mystical intuition or feeling of God, on the other, the Evangelical Faith in the Reconciler begins to appear. Whenever the mystic finds in Christ's atoning for guilt, and in his being security for the overcoming of sin, the correct conclusion of the mystical process—then is he, upon the whole, open to the world of history as the theatre of di-vine acts; consequently, to the original records of this his-tory—the Sacred Scriptures, as well as to the Church which preaches Christ; an inward coyness toward which Mysticism, as such, did not overcome. As the mystical love to God was then become love toward the father of Jesus Christ, and to Christ, so this same love cannot but be in him as love to the brethren. And thus, is the mystic, without giving up his inwardness, nay, much more, by reason of its true penetra-ting and unifying tendency, brought into the service of man-kind. The mystical energy now manifests itself in a positive, though, at the same time, inwardly free relation to human interest, especially to the Church.

But if now, after this inner course, the mystic return to the Church, he occupies a position different from that in which he stood before, when yet in child-like union with her on the ground of simple historical faith. The return to the Church cannot be a blind uncritical submission, else would a new slavery, a new separation from God through human inter-vention, a new mechanism deprive him of the entire gain of the past. Indeed, the Mediæval Church is not so consti-tuted, as to be able to escape criticism from the newly attained light and energy of the mind.

But according to what law, shall criticism upon the Church be exercised? and how manifest love for her by laboring for her reformation? According to the law of mystical subjec-tivity? But if this appeal to the Spirit of God, so does the

Church. And if it thus become a question of human authority, the Church certainly should be heard rather than the individual. We see, then, that the criticism necessary for the reformation of the Church, is an impossibility, and we must abide by the authority of the Church which sanctions even its corruptions; or there must be an authority independent of both these parties, transcending them, and rightfully claiming submission from both. As both lay claim to Christianity, the question: Which of the two has apostatized from that which is truly Christian? must be decided by comparison with the *original record of primitive Christianity, found in the Sacred Scriptures*. This must be accepted as the rule for the determination of the controversy between the Church and the pious subject. If, then, Mysticism would be of any worth to the Church, it must put on a more objective character by receiving into itself the *character of scripturalness*. But it must, in order to gain and represent the true knowledge of the Holy Scripture, first of all, open communications with the Scriptures, and not dread the labor of a thorough understanding of them; it must, before it seek to judge the Church by the Scriptures, receive into itself a more canonical method. The Holy Scripture must be understood according to its true sense—out of the whole—else caprice and allegory can, through it, establish any imaginable thing—even Roman Catholicism itself. Mysticism must, therefore, first enter the school of the Sacred Scripture. In this she will acquire firmness and certainty; because she will then base these not merely upon her subjective feelings, but upon the immovable foundation of the objective testimony, independent of subjectivity, given of itself by historical Christianity.

Hence the importance of the *biblical factor in the preparation of the Reformation*. The Waldenses, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, in a more sober mind and by more widely extended operations, promoted, through the word of Scripture, the renewal of the Church. In proportion to the increasing depth and the more complete return of these movements from the more superficial conflicts with the Romish Church, did they become more friendly to mysticism. And they, on the other

hand, were greatly improved by this friendly contact in inwardness and freedom, and, on the other, Mysticism, determined by them and their Scripture-knowledge, grew in discretion and simple practical spirit; while both became constantly more vitally sensible of the necessity of atonement for guilt and of redemption from sin; and thus grew also in intelligent love to primitive Christianity, as the standard for the condition of the Church.

The biblical principle was, first, to take its own independent way, influenced neither by the Church nor by Mysticism, in order that when the proper time should come, it might flow into the common stream and bring its contribution to the Reformation-principle. Even the representatives of the biblical tendency had to undergo a purifying process before they could master the deeper contents of Scripture, and thereby become susceptible of that inwardness, of which Mysticism was, from the beginning, the representative. This is seen in the Waldenses, who while they rejected the authority of the Church, its magical and hierarchical elements, its gorgeous ritualistic display, its sacrifice of the mass and its doctrine of purgatory, still made the Scriptures too much a mere outward law, gave no essential place to atonement and regeneration, had no idea of justifying faith, and continued in harmony with those aspects of the Romish system, which were favorable, even though in a legal manner, to their earnest moral spirit, and which did homage to the righteousness of works. While Wickliffe translated the Scripture and set it up as the sole authority in opposition to Church-tradition, denied transubstantiation and the sacramental character of confirmation and ordination; while he rejected all self-wrought merit, as well as all dependence upon any authority intermediate between God and man, he still regarded immediate access to God rather in the sense simply of free access to the Holy Scripture and to the knowledge of God's commands. He established a distinction between the visible and the invisible Church, but made the latter entirely subject to the state. The religious element does not with him attain to an independent development, but continues in one-sided dependence

upon the moral and the civil; and he seems to have little conception of the real nature of justification, or of the truth that peace with God is much rather the condition, than the fruit, of true morality.

Huss manifests a more powerful religious interest, especially in his doctrine of faith. He seeks immediate fellowship with God, not mere connection with God's law and commandment; makes contrition the sign of election, but not a good work which merits grace. In him, the stand-point of Augustine, where there is a high position for grace, is once more attained. But he does not so pass beyond Augustine that grace becomes clearly, as well immediately justifying as sanctifying; nor has the relative independence of justification, over against sanctification, become clear to his mind.

But these representatives of the biblical tendency did a great preparatory work. Especially was this the result when it came into connection with scientific and literary culture. The revival of science and learning, just before the Reformation, was closely connected with it. In few points in the entire world's history, is it, indeed, so strikingly manifest, how even the most distant things unintentionally, as if in secret connected by the hand of Providence, may work together for the accomplishment of great and new ends. There was a grand succession of inventions and discoveries, following, stroke upon stroke, about the same time, which, though occurring upon entirely different spheres, and externally independent of each other, did yet come together in one result. And it is the Reformation alone which possesses the key to the right understanding of their simultaneous appearance, and leads to the consecration of them to the true service of mankind. It was thus that there were raised up in the numerous universities founded in the fifteenth century men who sought to bring the reformatory principle, hitherto but silently operative, and the treasures of the deeper religious life into the free light of science, and into the form of a more developed and purified doctrine. In these men Mysticism began to take the yet required step beyond itself, and theology to approach more nearly the decisive point which was to

be the watchword of the Reformation—justification by faith. In proportion to their application of Scripture-knowledge and scientific energy to the wants of the deeper religious spirit, did they attain to a more penetrating understanding of the peculiar essence of Christianity—of the personal work of Christ, as well as of faith in him. Their way was devious and their steps were faltering. Indeed, as we see in these men, on the one hand, with what difficulty and how slowly the pure conception of the Christian truth freed itself from the mediæval representations; how many errors were overcome by them only step by step, and imperfectly; how apparently small defects did often cripple the entire reformatory power of the new knowledge; how often even the exaggeration of the antagonism to Romish error did yet again become involved with the principle of them—so do we in this, and this only, receive a full and vital impression of the difficulty and magnitude of the work in which they were engaged.

In one of these men especially theology did attain to the point from which the Reformation could take its first great onward step, whenever the organ for its full expression, and the agency for its practical application, should have been provided. This was John Wessel, a man of high scientific culture, at home alike in scholasticism and in the Hebrew and classical languages, animated by an inward fresh life of mysticism, and all this in connection with the Holy Scriptures. In Paris, where he taught, he was called *Lux Mundi*, the light of the world. Of him Luther says: "If I had before read Wessel, my opponents would think: 'Luther has taken all from Wessel,' so completely do our minds harmonize. This is to me a source of special joy and strength." He calls him 'a rare and lofty spirit, one who has proved himself a true theologian.' This man is especially distinguished by the fact, that, by him, faith is, at last, brought to a central position. To Mysticism faith had appeared to be too insignificant to lead to salvation. By repentance, but especially through contemplation or love—according as it was more theoretical or more ethical in its spirit and tendency—it desired and expected to effect transition to God. Wessel sees

that, on account of what is involved in sin, it is impossible, in this way, to begin the process of salvation. In his view it must be initiated by faith. He does not, indeed, apprehend faith as a mere opinion, or holding as true—merely as historical faith, but he imbues it with his mysticism. According to him, it is, in general, confidence, undoubtedly a moral act, consisting in trust and a sense of security, in reference to another. But especially does he regard Christian faith as the apprehension of the entire Christ, who is, to him, reconciler as well as sanctifier and dispenser of salvation. Faith, in his view, is not productive, like love; but also not merely passive and lifeless, like the merely permitting of oneself to be determined by the authority and magic of the Church, or like the mystical resignation; it is an act of the will, yet of the will desiring to be the subject of the act of God in Christ. Thus does he overcome the Pelagian and the magical tendencies by *a union of the true elements in both*. He refuses any longer to allow the division according to which, forgiveness of sin is to be ascribed to the merit of Christ, and the attaining of salvation to our love—even though it should be divinely infused love. Christ bears in himself the inexhaustible power of the entire salvation. But he does not operate in a *magical way*. He is to be apprehended by *faith*, to which each of his gifts is appropriated in its order. As in his view none of the benefits of redemption, whether of sanctification or of salvation, exist out of Christ, or without faith, he gains in this way with faith a specific distinction between the natural and the spiritual life—a turning point. The righteousness of God, which, in Mysticism, was usually absorbed in the divine love, and in the church-system, was rather exchanged with it than penetrated by it—comes, for the first time, into its true position in the system of Wessel. With him the imperative of righteousness, the honor of God and the guilt of man, are all estimated according to their true significance. Christ is mediator not merely between God and man, but between the righteous God and the God desiring to be merciful. In him we behold, says he, not only the reconciled, but the reconciling God, inasmuch as God

having become man, performs, effects, and calls forth, what his righteousness requires. According to him it is possible for God to regard us as righteous, that is, as satisfactory to the law, in that he looks upon Christ as the security for our fulfillment of the law, and upon us, believers as united with him. The righteous is certain of his virtue, but by reason of actual communion with Christ.

But such a doctrine transforms also the idea of the *Church*, for now all belong to the Church who are united to Christ in faith, hope, love, whether they are under the Pope and the Romish Church, or in schismatic community. By this conception of faith he comes also to the *universal priesthood*, which he expressly distinguishes from the priesthood of the order—the special, existing only for the sake of order—in which, and alongside of which, the universal is to be perpetuated. He will not allow the so often abused image of the clergy, as shepherds, and the congregation as a flock, to be carried out beyond evangelical measure. The flock, he declares, is one which has reason and freedom; it may not, therefore, be reduced by the shepherd to a state of blind and passive obedience. There are cases in which the flock must take care of itself. In regard to the authority of the Church, he teaches: ‘We believe the gospel for God’s sake, the Pope and Church for the gospel’s sake, but not Christ on account of the Church.’ The famous declaration of Augustine: ‘I would not have believed the gospel, if regard for the Church had not moved me,’ he explains so as to make faith in the gospel arise through the ministration of the Church, but not so as to place the consideration due to the Church higher than our respect for the gospel. If the majority be against us, it must awaken doubt in us, but, in the end, the gospel only can decide. Many of the popes have erred fundamentally and fatally. If the pope build not up, resist him; for he is subject to the gospel, and has authority only as he is its champion. He exists without dogmatic significance and only for the sake of order.

And yet the power of the pope continued unshaken, and
VOL. II. No. 3.

all the attempts at the reformation of the Church failed. But while Leo X. on his brilliant throne, was, in 1517, in triumph closing the Lateran Council, the papacy having come off victorious over all opposition, and seeming to stand more firmly than ever before, there existed already in an obscure place in Germany the man who was to be the organ for the complete utterance and the effectual application of the great principle of the Reformation.

ARTICLE II.

THE DESCENT OF MAN AND SEXUAL SELECTION IN RELATION TO SEX. BY CHARLES DARWIN. 2 VOLS. 12MO. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK. 1871.

By Rev. Prof. CYRUS THOMAS, De Soto, Ill., Ass't U. S. Geol. Survey.

In a former article, we promised, God willing, to present some further objections to Mr. Darwin's theory of "Natural Selection," on which he bases the hypothesis of the "Descent of Man." As we do not desire to travel over ground which has already been explored by those much abler than ourselves, we shall try to confine our criticisms to those points which have not been noticed, or which have not been fully discussed, devoting the greater portion of the present article to an examination of the theory as applied to man.

Therefore we will first call attention to some other objections to which we think the theory is obnoxious in its general application.

The Duke of Argyll* incidentally calls attention to the insufficiency of the hypothesis of Natural Selection to account for the production of organs which can be of no advantage in their incipient stages. This idea has subsequently been more thoroughly discussed by Mr. Mivart in his "Genesis of Species;" and, so far as we are aware, this objection has not

*North British Review, June, 1867, p. 288, (we learn elsewhere that the Duke is the author of this very able article).

been thoroughly answered by Mr. Darwin, or any of the advocates of his theory.

In order to present fully the force of this objection, we call attention to the position Mr. Darwin takes. He says, "Slight individual differences, however, suffice for the work, and are probably the sole differences which are effective in the production of new species."* And, in his *Origin of Species*, he admits: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down."†

As a matter of course we are to presume that Mr. Darwin intended this as a fair and candid admission and applicable to the point at issue. Then it is equivalent to saying, that if it can be demonstrated that any complex organ exists which could not, in accordance with his theory, have been formed by numerous, successive slight modifications, his theory must break down. By his theory Natural Selection will only develop those small variations which, when they appear, prove advantageous in the struggle for existence. If any complex organs can be found which could not be advantageous in their incipient states, it follows that these could not be developed by natural selection. Mr. Mivart has called attention to a number of examples of this kind, as the asymmetrical heads of flat-fishes; the formation of limbs in the higher animals; the development of whalebone (baleen) in the mouth of the whale; the formation of the eye and ear, wings of birds, &c.

In addition to these examples, we would refer to the wings of certain beetles (Coleoptera) and bugs (Hemiptera) which reside in the water—among the former the Dyticidæ, and among the latter the Notonectidæ, which are found distributed throughout the world.

These insects are possessed of both upper and under wings, the latter being adapted to and used by them in flight, although they pass their entire existence, from the egg to the

*Animals and Plants under Domestication, II. 192.

†Page, 111.

close of the imago or perfect state, in the water (except their occasional flights in the air). The wing of an insect is certainly a complex organ, and can be adapted to but one purpose, and, in order to accomplish this purpose, requires certain peculiar adaptations of several parts of the body. Muscles must be formed or adapted to its use, and Mr. Burmeister says that "not only the muscles which are attached to the organs of flight, but all those found in the thorax, participate in producing it (flight)."* It should also be borne in mind that wings in insects are not the homologues of limbs, as in birds, but are more in the nature of shriveled trachæa or lungs, which renders the difficulty of accounting for their production, if possible, greater than if they were counterparts of the limbs.

According to the hypothesis of Mr. Darwin, these must have been developed from minute variations because those variations were found to be advantageous in the struggle for existence. And as this development was in a given direction, to wit, as organs of flight, then their advantage in all stages must have been in this same direction. Of what possible advantage as organs of flight could these have been in their incipient state to these aquatic insects? If they were beneficial in this state, it must have been as organs of flight, and not as swimmerets or trachæa—as natural selection would have developed them to their maximum of utility in that direction, and not as organs of flight—but it is absurd to suppose they could have been useful as organs of flight until developed.

Here, then, is a complex organ which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, slight modifications, by natural selection, upon the theory that this law or force develops only those variations which are advantageous in the struggle for existence. But perhaps the reply is made that there are many insects which, during their existence, have but abortive wings, and therefore our objection would apply with equal force to these. The case is somewhat stronger when applied to aquatic than to terrestrial species, and so far as Mr. Dar-

*Manual of Ent. I. §266.

win's theory is concerned, we think it impossible to account for these abortive wings, or wings in any case. But suppose we cannot account for them, does this lessen the difficulty in the way of the hypothesis of Natural Selection? Must we accept a theory which is hemmed in by insuperable difficulties because we cannot explain those difficulties on any other hypothesis? If so, then it is better to ascribe these things to the direct application of creative power, and thus cut the gordian knot, because we thus place the secret in the hands to which it belongs. But we think there is a method of explaining this upon a theory much more reasonable than that proposed by Mr. Darwin.

It also appears to be difficult, on Mr. Darwin's theory, to account for what is term "parthenogenesis," or the continued reproduction of individuals, in animals where the sexes are distinct, without the intervention of the male for a number of generations. One example is sufficient to present the force of this difficulty.

The Aphides, or plant lice, usually at the end of the summer produce individuals of both sexes, the females deposit fecundated eggs, which in the spring produce only females; these females, without fresh impregnation, produce another brood likewise all females; this method of reproduction continuing some seven or eight generations, until the close of the season, when the last brood consists of individuals of both sexes. During the summer, while this strange method of reproduction is going on, instead of depositing eggs, these females are ovoviviparous. It appears to be possible by introducing them into some situation where the proper temperature can be maintained to continue this method of reproduction, without the intervention of males, for an indefinite length of time. The writer has observed this singular process going on even in the winter when the snow was on the ground, in the case of an aphid that feeds on young winter wheat.

We are aware that it is exceedingly difficult to furnish any satisfactory explanation of this abnormal process, and do not present it as an objection to the theory of Natural Selection

that it fails to give the solution, but because it appears to stand in direct opposition to that theory. To say that it is the result of a law implanted in the nature of these insects, explains nothing, but to say that it was brought about gradually, by slight modifications, appears to be assuming that which must necessarily be in direct conflict with natural laws. When it is a law—in a given group—that the union of the sexes is necessary to reproduction, how is a change from this method to take place by slight modifications?

The great error which Mr. Darwin, and those who advocate his theory, fall into, and which vitiates all their arguments and conclusions is, looking wholly at one side of the question, shutting their eyes to every influence but the one. While there may be a tendency to vary, there may be a law directing this tendency and limiting it to the production of given forms. The array of examples showing a tendency in one direction, does not necessarily prove this to be the law which governs, for another force, moving in another direction, may so modify the former as to give a third course as the ultimate result. If we examine the movement of bodies, we shall find that these motions are always curvilinear, even the line described by a falling body, in a vacuum, is not straight in the absolute sense. Shall we therefore conclude that it is a law of matter to move in a curved line when put in motion? A theory built upon such an inference, although supported by an infinite array of examples, would scarcely supplant the Newtonian doctrine that this is the resultant of forces moving in straight lines; we believe the attempt was made a few years since, but it scarcely made a ripple on the surface of scientific opinion. Even if we admit that Mr. Darwin's theory of variation and natural selection is substantially correct, it does not necessarily follow that the results must coincide with the direction of this law or force, for another force may very materially change the results.

Admit that there is a tendency to vary in every direction, and that natural selection tends to develop the advantageous variations to the maximum of utility; there is also, as we

know by daily observation, a law of nature, that like shall produce like; what reason have we for assuming that time will enable the former to overcome the latter?

Having pointed out some of the difficulties which appear to us to oppose themselves to the reception of this theory, and which indicate its insufficiency to account for the immense variety of animated forms that people the earth, let us turn our attention to its application to man.

As remarked in the former article, even if we were to admit the theory of development by natural selection to be true in regard to all animals below man, it does not necessarily follow that he is subject to the same law, or that he forms one link in the great chain. And at this point Mr. Wallace, one of the founders of the hypothesis, hesitates, and appears to consider the gap too broad to be bridged by this theory alone.

If man, as a species, has been developed from some lower form, it is evident that we must look for that form among the apes, or some intermediate extinct group; the anthropoid apes making the nearest approach of any living species.

Let us then notice some of the prominent differences between man and the monkey. We do not allude to the difference in physical structure, for we frankly confess that our knowledge of comparative anatomy is not sufficient to do this properly, and, moreover, it is wholly unnecessary in the objections we desire to present.

One of the first and most apparent is, that one makes use of instruments by means of which he overcomes force and accomplishes that which he is unable to do with his natural organs, while the other does not. How does Mr. Darwin meet this objection? He brings forward a few instances—and very few—where the chimpanzee has been known to use stones to crack some native fruits. And the inference he would have us draw, is, that if a few monkeys have done this, it is an evidence of a dawning intellect, and being advantageous in the struggle for existence, may be developed, by natural selection, into that knowledge which enables us to dig the ore from the earth and convert it into instruments of

a thousand forms; to construct an endless variety of machinery to assist in the various operations of life; to make telescopes with which we can sound the depths of the universe, and microscopes with which we can reveal the hitherto invisible things of nature; and to construct railroads on which we can sweep over the land at a speed that equals the Arabian courser.

Such, in part, is the vast fabric we are asked to believe was built on this small foundation. To ask us to believe that this is reasonable, appears to be more than Mr. Darwin can do; but he suggests that such may have been the fact. Is it reasonable? This is the true test, and this we ask. If it will not bear this test, it is certainly hazardous to hang such important conclusions upon it.

An examination of the monuments of Egypt show us how the monkey and man appeared side by side some three or four thousand years ago. In one of Champollion's magnificent plates* we notice a *Cynocephalus* represented as walking on its feet, bearing in its hand an instrument of some kind. And another on its feet elevating its hands in adoration of the goddess Tefnu. The figures on another monument represent the conquered nations bringing tributes—among these we see the monkey led by a leash, in the same manner as by the organ-grinders of the present day.† Many of the figures on these monuments are allegorical, but they are founded on some knowledge of nature; the figure of the hawk-headed Ra would never have been made unless those who made it had seen a hawk; and those figures showing the tributes brought, are doubtless intended to be true to nature. If man, in the three or four thousand years which have passed since these figures were made, has advanced so greatly in regard to those things which relate to the operations of life, how are we to account for the fact that the *Cynocephalus* is no farther advanced to-day than it was in the days of Rameses III?

*Monuments de L'Egypt et de La Nubie. By Champollion le jeune. Vol. I. Pl. 51.

†Egypt. By Champollion—Figeac. Pl. 92.

We presume the advocates of the theory of natural selection will call this trifling with the subject. That they will contend that Egypt of to-day can scarcely claim a higher position than Egypt under the "Old Empire;" that they will attribute the advance to another race and to the active *mind* of man; and that they will call four thousand years but a moment of time, compared with the illimitable ages they assume for the operations of the law of evolution.

If Egyptians have not advanced, the race has, Egyptian art, learning and knowledge forming, in part, the base upon which this advance has been founded. The monkey, from that day to the present, and if the doctrine of selection be true, for thousands of years before, has been more or less in contact with man, yet in all this time has learned nothing more of the use of instruments than to crack a nut occasionally with a stone. And even this is an art known to but a favored few; it is not even a specific character.

The horse has been the companion of man as far back as history reaches; yet those represented on the temple of Ib-samboul as drawing the chariot of Rameses III.* are equal, in every respect, to those of the present day. The bit was then used as now, yet this usage for thousands of years appears to have made no difference in its mouth; and even the check rein was used then as now, indicating the same habit in harness that we see exhibited now. Is it not strange that such a long usage of this docile animal, on which man has bestowed so much care, has made absolutely no change in his form, habits or mental powers (if possessed of a mind), while his companion, man, has, in several respects at least, made such rapid strides?

Four thousand years is a large unit of measure, and is an appreciable portion of one hundred thousand, or even two hundred thousand years. And if even in the longer term such great advance has been made, some portion of it ought to be visible in the time which has elapsed since the earlier

*Champollion. *Mon. Egypt. et Nub.* Vol. I. Pl. 15.

monuments of Egypt were built. It should also be borne in mind that we have limited our estimate of the age of these remains according to the calculations of Bunsen,* who fixes the Old Empire's duration at 1076 years, that of the Middle Empire, or Dynasties of the Shepherd Kings, at 900 years, and that of the New Empire, down to Alexander, at 1300 years; but if we were to follow with the credulity of Mr. Darwin every statement which appeared to favor our argument, we might accept the entire chronology of Manetho which would carry us back nearly 25,000 years before the time of Alexander.†

Another marked and important difference between man and the animals which make the nearest approach to him in physical structure, is the use of language.

Mr. Darwin, in order to account for this on his hypothesis, presents the following facts and surmises. That in Paraguay the *Cebus azaræ*, when excited, utters at least six distinct sounds, which excite in other monkeys similar emotions. That the dog since being domesticated has learned to bark in at least four or five distinct tones. That the sounds uttered by birds offer, in several respects, the closest analogy to language, for all the members of the same species utter the same instinctive cries expressive of their emotions; and all the kinds that have the power of singing, exert this power instinctively. But, he says, it has been proved that these sounds (of birds) are no more innate than language in man. He then goes on to state "that primeval man, or rather the early progenitor of man, probably used his voice largely, as does one of the gibbon-apes of the present day, in producing true musical cadences, that is, singing. * * The imitation by articulate sounds of musical cries *might have given rise to words* expressive of various complex emotions. * * As the voice was used, more and more, the vocal organs would have been

*Egypt's Place in History, Vol. I.

†The reader will bear in mind the fact that we are conducting this discussion without appeal to the Holy Scriptures; trusting that the result will show that nature can only be read correctly in the light of Revelation.

strengthened and perfected through the principle of the inherited effects of use; and this would have reacted on the power of speech."*

The fact that animals utter sounds indicative of emotions, forms but a minute beginning from which to develop the languages in use among the races of men. But if we examine carefully the examples given—and we suppose Mr. Darwin has brought forward the best possible for his argument—we shall find that even these do not harmonize with the theory of natural selection. This hypothesis requires that, that variation which is of advantage shall be developed by natural selection in the direction in which it is advantageous in the struggle for existence. And when it is assumed that a certain variation was the beginning from which a given organ or faculty was developed, this development must be continuous to the maximum of utility; hence, if human language was developed from these utterances of animals, they must have gradually approached nearer and nearer to that perfection which could properly be denominated language. Therefore, those sounds uttered by the animals which approach nearest to man in physical organization, should have the closest approximation to articulate language. But Mr. Darwin informs us that the notes or sounds of birds offer, in several respects, the closest analogy to language. Here, then, we see, that in order to find something on which to base his theory in respect to the development of this important faculty, he passes back over the entire class of mammals to that of birds. If these animals make the nearest approach, in the utterance of sounds, to that of the human voice, is it not strange that when we rise to that group which makes the closest approximation, physically, to man, we find there has been no progress, but, in fact, a retrocession? The progress from the bird to the chimpanzee is a long step, during which immense changes occurred; the wings were converted into legs, the feathers into hair, the beak into a mouth with teeth;

*Desc. Man. 1. 52—55.

yet the development in the power of uttering sounds made no advance. But, behold! what a rapid advance is made in this respect in the next step. Mr. Darwin must take one or the other horn of the dilemma; his examples prove nothing, or they prove too much. An infinite number of examples prove nothing, unless they are applicable to the case.

The simple fact that animals have the power of uttering sounds, cannot be adduced as evidence in favor of this theory as applied to the origin of human language. The katy-dids and the cicadæ utter loud and distinct sounds, often making the woods resound with their notes; but the one has a special arrangement of the elytra for this purpose, and the other a special organ at the base of the abdomen. We can refer to well attested instances of owls collecting together at night and dancing round, apparently in concert and to the sound of their own discordant notes. Shall we infer from this that the dancing propensisy, in a large number of the human family, has been developed from the nocturnal orgies of the owls? Surely one is about as reasonable as the other. Yet such are the arguments presented to establish the theory that man, with all his powers of mind and an immortal soul, is but a transformed ape.

The architectural art and use of dress, especially among the advanced races, forms a wide difference between the habits of the monkey and man. But Mr. Darwin undertakes to show or indicate, at least, that the germs of these habits are to be found in the apes, and he does it after this manner.

"The anthropomorphous apes, guided *probably* by instinct, build for themselves temporary platforms; but as many instincts *are largely controlled by reason*, the simpler one, such as this of building a platform, *might* readily pass into a voluntary and conscious act. The orang is known to cover itself at night with the leaves of the Pandanus; and Brehm states that one of his baboons used too protect itself from the heat of the sun, by throwing a straw mat over its head. In these latter habits, we *probably* see the first steps toward some of the

simpler arts; namely, rude architecture and dress, as they arose among the early progenitors of man.”*

As this is a specimen of his reasoning on a subject of so much importance as the descent of man, let us examine it somewhat carefully. There are three suppositions: “guided probably,” “might readily pass,” and “we probably see.” In the second place, there is a virtual contradiction; for he says they are “guided probably by instinct,” and then asserts that “many instincts are largely controlled by reason.” He evidently makes a distinction between instinct and reason; and bases the conclusion drawn here upon the presumption, or rather assertion, that instinct is often controlled by reason.

If the two are distinct, then so far as instinct is controlled by reason it is no longer instinct; and if these are guided by instinct to build platforms, they are not guided by reason. The simpler instincts, such as this of building a platform, he says, “might readily pass into a voluntary and conscious act.” By what process is this change to take place? Upon what fact does he base such supposition? And why does he assume that a simple instinct will pass into a conscious act any sooner than a more complex one, which seems more like an act of reason than the simpler one? And here Mr. Darwin’s examples again prove nothing or they prove too much. What person that has seen it, has failed to admire the nest of the oriole, built with so much care and skill; and we might name hundreds of other birds which build nests that display a much higher degree of workmanship than the platform of the apes referred to. The beaver cuts down trees, strips them of their branches, and with them builds a dam with such skill that the first one the writer saw—as it was in an inhabited section of the country—he could hardly be convinced was not the work of man’s hands.

But if we descend much lower in the scale of being, we find instinct leading animals to form structures much more complex than the simple platform of the ape. The comb of the bee and the nest of the wasp are known to every one.

*Desc. Man. I. 51.

A species of Neuropterous insects, the *Termes fatale*, a kind of ant, builds a nest from eight to ten feet high, with halls and galleries almost as numerous and intricate as the Labyrinth of Labæis. If the argument of Mr. Darwin had any force in it, then, we might yet hope to find Gulliver's Lilliputians somewhere in Africa as the descendants of the Termites. We do not appeal to ridicule as an argument, but we cannot see any stronger reason for believing, from Mr. Darwin's argument, that man is a descendant of the ape because it builds a platform, than that a small race of men should descend from these mound-building ants.

If the germs of architectural art began to show themselves on the insects, and appeared in an advanced stage in the birds, the apes ought to know how to construct, at least, a pretty good log-cabin. But it may be claimed that the ape has not been developed from the bird, or mammals from birds, or birds from insects. Then we must suppose each of these represents a separate advancing line from a common progenitor. And as the bird and insect, so far as art is concerned, have outstripped the ape, what is to be their next step? Has that step already, as in the case of the ape, been made? and, if so, where is the descendant?

We repeat what we have before said, that collecting together a multitude of disconnected facts proves nothing, except the patience of the collector. They must be applicable if they are to be received as evidence. We might take up the greater portion of the facts in these volumes and show their utter want of applicability, but our space is too limited, and we must turn to other questions of more importance.

We have traveled to this point with Mr. Mivart, and have found him an agreeable companion, but here our roads separate. We cannot accept the theory that man has descended from a lower form of being, no matter in what form it is presented, whether natural selection, external influences, or a law of organic matter. First, because we do not think it is a reasonable inference from the laws and phenomena of nature; second, because we think it is wholly inconsistent with the idea of an immortal soul in man; and last, though not

least, because we think it wholly inconsistent with the statements of the Holy Scriptures. But, while this is the case, we do not stand in such mortal terror of the idea that man may have lived upon the earth more than six, or even ten thousand years, that we should reject the theory on that account. For, although we believe the Bible to be a revelation from God, yet we do not have the most implicit confidence in the chronological calculations which have been made in regard to the pre-Abrahamic age. We have strong doubts as to whether the numbers in the earlier part of the Mosaic records are properly understood; and we can see no more impropriety in using scientific facts, than historical records, to aid us in chronological researches. We think the date of Adam's creation is yet an undetermined fact; it may have been six, or it may have been ten thousand years ago; yet the data we have, certainly point to a time which can reach back but a small portion of the age that the theory of development requires.

We are not so wedded to the idea, that the body of Adam was at first formed of full stature, and that into this form God breathed the breath of life, as to believe it to be an inseparable part of revelation. "God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul"—this we must believe if we believe the word of God. What the process of this formation was we are not informed; whether our Creator formed him from a germ, or in full stature, we do not know; and the one supposition is no more opposed to Revelation than the other. To suppose that he was thousands of years growing to full manhood, is no more opposed to express statements of the Bible than to suppose the same length of time was required to form the animals. But one fact we think does stand out clearly and boldly, and that is, that the creation of man was a separate and distinct act from the production of plants and animals; and we also think the sacred records clearly indicate that the process of the formation of the two was not the same.

We are glad this question has assumed so much importance

in the public mind, for we feel confident the investigations and discussions which grow out of it will, in the end, add new evidence to the truth of this wonderful Record. Already it has driven from the scientific arena the doctrine of a plurality of species in the human family, thus wheeling one more disputed point into the ranks of Bible evidences. There is also another important question, on which this discussion appears to be unconsciously throwing some rays of light. We simply allude to it, but not attempt to explain.

Mr. Darwin often speaks of the male of the human species bearing the rudiments of organs which appear to be purely feminine in their offices. The Bible informs us that God formed woman from one of man's ribs; there is something deeply significant in this, and, whether the statement be figurative or literal, the great fact which underlies it is not changed. What does this method of woman's formation indicate? That it was intended only teach a lesson can scarcely be imagined. Let us turn to our Saviour's words and see how the relation stands at the other end of the race: "For when they shall rise from the dead they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven." We leave the reader to draw his own conclusions; adding only that these words and the doctrine of development cannot easily be reconciled with each other.

Not only do we believe that the doctrine of development as applied to man is opposed to the Bible, but that it is inconsistent with reason, facts and history. And first, we do not think it possible for any theory of development to explain or account for the origination of the religious idea, or the idea of a future state.

Mr. Darwin not only admits, but presents arguments to prove, the specific identity of the races of men;* and also gives it as his opinion that Africa was the home of the original stock.† But it is proper to state, that he does not think it necessarily follows that all have sprung from a single pair, although originating in the same part of the world. We have, then,

*Desc. Man. I. 223—225.

†Ib. I. 191.

three points agreed upon, first, the unity of the species; second, that this species arose in a limited faunal district; and, third, that this district was situated on the old continent.

Mr. Darwin admits that before dispersion and the division into different races, certain practices, habits, etc., had been acquired and had become common; and this admission is made from the fact that these prevail among the widely dispersed groups at the present time. He also embraces in this category, mental faculties, as he remarks: "As it is improbable that the numerous and unimportant points of resemblance between the several races of men in bodily structure and mental faculties—I do not here refer to similar customs—should all have been independently acquired, they must have been inherited from progenitors who were thus characterized. We thus gain some insight into the early state of man, before he had spread, step by step, over the face of the earth."* He also quotes, approvingly, Sir J. Lubbock's statement that the art of making fire and forming rude canoes or rafts, was known before man wandered from his original birth-place.

Now let us apply the same method of reasoning to the facts in regard to the religious idea and the belief in a future state. He denies that there is any evidence that man was "aboriginally endowed with the ennobling belief in the existence of Omnipotent God." And asserts that numerous races have existed, and still exist, which have no idea of one or more gods.

This is an unfair and somewhat artful statement of the case, considering his stand-point. But let us see what the proofs are, and in the few pages left us we can but glance at some of them.

First, we appeal to Mr. Darwin, who says immediately after the denial just referred to: "If we include under the term 'religion' the belief in unseen or spiritual agencies, the case is wholly different,"† that is to say, this belief is universal. Herbert Spencer admits a form of "religious belief through-

*Desc. Man. I. 225.

†Ib. I. 63.

out the world." Mr. Tylor, whom Mr. Darwin quotes, says "There may well have been, and there still may be, low races destitute of any belief in a future state. Nevertheless prudent ethnographers must often doubt accounts of such, for this reason, that the savage who declares that the dead live no more, may really mean to say, that they are dead."* And again: "So far as I can judge from the immense mass of accessible evidence, we have to admit that the belief in spiritual beings appears among all low races with whom we have attained to thoroughly intimate acquaintance."† Professor Caldwell remarks on this point as follows: "Whether there are any tribes altogether destitute of the conception of a future state seems exceedingly doubtful, many of the instances in which this was supposed to be the case having now been turned over to swell the vast multitude of examples to the contrary."‡ Quotations, showing this to be the case, can be multiplied to almost any extent, but this is unnecessary. It is, therefore, evident that before the dispersion of the race from the original birth-place, man must have possessed a belief in spiritual agencies, the future state, and some form of religion. Suppose we admit that there are a few savage tribes which have no form of religious belief, yet the number of widely distant and different races that do, prove this with ten-fold more certainty than any proof in regard to development. The attempt of Mr. Darwin, Spencer, and others, to account for the origin of the belief in spiritual agencies by dreams, does not necessarily come into our present line of argument. But we will make this suggestion, that dreams can never grasp a thought, or contain an idea, that the mind is incapable of in the awakened state; second, that an analysis of mental operations will show that belief in spiritual agencies cannot precede a belief in, or some idea of, a future state. In other words, some form of belief in regard to an indwelling, incorporeal existence, lies at the base of a belief in spiritual agencies. Even if Mr. Darwin should find some

*Primitive Culture. II. 17.

†Ib. I. 384.

‡Contemp. Rev., Jan., 1872, 217.

tribes which believe in spiritual agencies, and yet have no form of religious belief, or idea of a future state, he cannot adduce this as a proof of his theory, until he first shows they have not arrived at this point by degeneracy. These opinions or arguments, in regard to the effect of dreams, are based on mere suppositions framed, by the advocates of development, to meet the difficulty which presents itself at this point. It is admitted that all believe in spiritual agencies; that, so far as careful investigation has been made, nearly or quite all have some idea of a future state; and there is abundant evidence showing that a large majority of the various races and tribes have some form of religious belief, embracing the idea of some invisible, over-ruling power or powers. And that even in the varied forms of worship, there are many things which indicate a common origin. It is clear, therefore—arguing upon the same principle by which Mr. Darwin proves the common origin of the human family—that before the dispersion (and here we confine the use of this word to Mr. Darwin's idea) the religious idea must have reached a much higher status than is at present found among the lower savage tribes.

If the facts prove anything, they certainly prove this; and if we desire to arrive at the truth, we must follow whithersoever our testimony leads us; otherwise we are obnoxious to the charge that our prejudices cause us to warp the evidence to sustain a pre-arranged theory. Therefore, so far as these facts give us any light on the subject, they show that these lower tribes have degenerated from a higher state of religious belief, which is in direct conflict with the hypothesis of development. Mr. Darwin, and the advocates of his theory, starting with the ape, judging by certain powers and mental characteristics of animals and man, form an hypothesis on this point, without attempting to offer any proof. With their eyes riveted on the workings of nature, they wholly forget that man has an historical record, which may cast a few rays of light into the gloom which surrounds them. If the various historical lines in regard to the development of the religious idea, when followed back as far as they can be traced,

are found to converge toward a certain point, surely this is some evidence, and ought to be of more value than mere suppositions designed expressly and avowedly to suit a certain theory. And the interposition of the objection of immense length of time cannot effect this until the evidence in regard to man's long residence on earth proves stronger than the historical evidences—and then they only modify and lessen the value of the latter, but do not destroy it. Secondly, if these historical evidences correspond in results with the few rays of light we gather by comparing the religious ideas of the scattered tribes of earth, then our conclusions are greatly strengthened.

“The religion of the Hindoos, which is called the *Brahmin*, is the most ancient of the present systems of religion upon the earth, and probably one of the oldest ever known.”* While we might differ with the Count in one sense, yet we agree in believing the Brahminical religion to date back even beyond the dawn of history. The oldest of the Vedas, according to Wilson, (if we recollect rightly) existed as early as the sixteenth century before the Christian era. Sir William Jones thinks the Yajur Veda can be traced as far back as 1580 B. C.; and Björnstjerna thinks they reach as high as 2800 B. C. The sacred volume begins with these words: “There is only one God, Brahma, omnipotent, eternal, omnipresent, the great soul, of which all other gods are but parts.”† Although the hymns are addressed to created objects, &c., yet the monotheistic idea is the fundamental doctrine, as is clearly shown by Mohun Rey, a native. But, perhaps, our best authority is Max Müller, who says: “The ancient religions of the world, were but the milk of the nature, which was in due time to be succeeded by the bread of life. After the primeval physiolatry, which was common to all the members of the Aryan family, had, in the hands of a wily priesthood, been changed into an empty idolatry, the Indian alone of all the Aryan nations produced a new form

*Theogony of the Hindoos. By Count M. Björnstjerna. 9.

†Ib. 9.

of religion, which has well been called subjective, as opposed to the more objective worship of nature."* The immortality of the soul is distinctly set forth, not merely as a philosophical proposition, but as a doctrine of religion.

But our object is only to show that as far back as we can trace the religious idea in this nation, it embraced a belief in an invisible, supreme controlling power; and the immortality of the soul, which we suppose no one will attempt to controvert.

The ancient form of the Egyptian religious idea, was substantially the same. Champollion-Figeac makes the following statement in regard to it: "C'était un monotheisme pur, se manifestant exterieurement par un polytheisme symbolique. * * Dans cette religion antique, comme dans toutes celles de l'ancien monde, on remarque trois points principaux savoir; le dogme, on la morale; la hierarchie, indiquant le rang et l'autorite des agents; enfin le culte, on la forme de ces agents."† He proceeds to state that it is quite certain that the Egyptians had arrived at the idea of "l'unite de Dieu," and the immortality of the soul.

Bunsen states that Ammon-Ra alone has the title of "Ruler," that he is called the "Lord of Heaven." Also that the Greeks rightly consider him as Zeus, and the highest god; that, according to Manetho, his name signifies "the concealed God." He also further remarks, that Egyptian mythology, as represented to us in its three orders, appears, on the whole, to have been completed at the commencement of the historical age or reign of Menes. Showing that even beyond the dawn of history, here the religious idea was fully developed with its highest psychological elements; and as he remarks "that the empire of Menes was based upon a venerable and intellectual foundation, which had been laid for many centuries in the valley of the Nile." The dim rays which come down to us from those remote times, show such an intimate relation between the theogony and religious ideas of

*Sanskrit Literature, p. 32.

†Egypte. in *L'Univers*, Vol. XII., p. 245.

the Hindoos and Egyptians, that their community of origin cannot be doubted; and Bunsen remarks, that "the cradle of the mythology and language of the Egyptians, is Asia."* The points of resemblance between the Hindoo and Egyptian religion and religious worship, are well set forth in a succinct form by Maria Child,† and need not be repeated here.

Turning to China, whose isolated history reaches far back into the centuries of the past, we can also trace the religious idea to the extreme of the historical rays, yet we find the case quite different here from what it was in the nations mentioned, for in the Celestial Empire religion has played but a subordinate part. In India the mystic element was the basis of philosophy and religion, while in China the realistic or practical element predominated. Schlegel remarks: "That in the intellectual character of the Chinese, reason, and not imagination, was the predominant element. * * Originally, when the old system of Chinese manners was regulated by the pure worship of God, not disfigured as among other nations by manifold fictions, but breathing the better spirit of Confucius, it was undoubtedly in a sound, upright reason, that the Chinese placed the foundation of their moral and political existence; since they designated the Supreme Being by the name Divine Reason." Their ancient books contain no specific doctrine concerning God, but they made frequent mention of One Invisible Being, under the name Chang-ti, which signifies Supreme Emperor. Their interpreters explain Tien, or heaven, as meaning "the firmament is the most glorious work produced by the Great First Cause." Confucius repeatedly recognizes the power over natural laws as residing in Heaven;‡ and the ancient scholiast on the "Doctrine of the Mean" on the words, "What heaven has conferred is called the nature, &c., remarks: "It shows how the path of duty is to be traced to its origin in Heaven, and is unchangeable."

*Egypt's Place in History, Bk. I. Sec. VI.

†Progress of Religious Ideas, I. 142. ‡Philosophy of Hist. 210.

§Analects, Bk. VII. ch. xxii. ch. xxiv. Bk. IX. ch. v. Legge's Chinese Classics. I.

Confucius also refers to the more ancient religious observances and practices, as he remarks: "He sacrificed to the *dead* as if they were present; he sacrificed to the spirits, as if the spirits were present;"* showing clearly a belief in the future state in spiritual agencies. He also speaks of the soul as that part of man's being which exercises devotion. It is, therefore, evident that the earliest form of the Chinese religion of which we can glean any notice, contained these four ideas, that of an Omnipotent, invisible Being; a future state; the soul as the seat of devotion; and spiritual agencies,

It is unnecessary for us to refer to the religious idea of the Jews, but we may refer to a thought thrown out by Max Müller, that the monotheism of the Jews and the Arabs point undoubtedly to the Abrahamic age as the time of the divergence of these two lines.

An examination of the Chaldean and Persian religious systems, will furnish substantially similar evidence.

So far, then, as we can trace the religious idea in the history of the nations of the Old World, we find them not only pointing to a time when the races were united and possessed in common some general religious ideas; but also that these were of a much higher grade than those held by the degraded savage tribes to which Mr. Darwin refers as furnishing evidence in behalf of his theory. But it may be said that these were on the same continent, and probably at an early day had more or less communication with each other. Let us, therefore, see if we can trace these fundamental religious ideas in any of the aboriginal nations of the western continent.

Chevalier says: "The religious beliefs and traditions of the ancient Mexicans offers analogies to the cosmogony or theology of the peoples of the old continent far too numerous for the coincidence to be considered as absolutely fortuitous."† Although their religious ceremonies were stained with the horrible practice of human sacrifices, this does not conflict

*Anal. Bk. III. ch. xii. Legge I. 23.

†Mexico Anc. and Mod. I. 144.

with the statement which Chevelier makes. Baron Humboldt* places the origin of this practice in the commencement of the fourteenth century, thus showing it to be a late graft upon their religious doctrines.

They believed in a Supreme God, the Creator and Master of the universe; in a future state, and in a paradise and its opposite. In addition to which they had many traditions and ceremonies bearing a striking resemblance to those of oriental nations. But these are too well known to repeat here, and are not necessary to establish our point, though forming strong cumulative evidence.

According to the older traditions of the Peruvians, the old form of religious belief which prevailed before the introduction of a new form by the Incas, embraced the belief in a Supreme Being, who was called Con, and had no human form or material body, but was an invisible and omnipotent spirit, which inhabited the universe. Belief in the immortality of the soul, was one of their fundamental religious ideas. They believed that after death, the good went to a beautiful, pleasant place; while the souls of the evil were tormented in a doleful place; and, that after a certain time, they would return to their bodies.†

So far, then, as we have any evidence in regard to the early religious belief of these nations, it points to the same origin as the early religions of the old world. And what is of importance to us at this time, it indicates that previous to the dispersion of the races, the status of the religious idea was of a much higher grade than that of many savage tribes at the present day.

We might multiply these evidences and authorities, but our space is too limited, and the religious and literary world are too well versed in these things to require it.

But we will refer to one other fact before we leave this point, which we think Mr. Darwin will scarcely object to on account of its very recent date. In a very able article, trans-

**Vue des Cordilleres*, 94.

†*Peruvian Antiquities*. Tschudi. chap. vii.

lated from the German, and published in the Smithsonian Report for 1867, showing man to have been the cotemporary of the mammoth and reindeer of middle Europe, we find the following statement. And we quote somewhat fully, to show that the writer is not opposed to granting ample time for man's early history.

"The first age of man must doubtless have comprised thousands of years. We know how slow must have been the development of the human race, and from the consideration that each generation stands on the shoulders of the preceding, and civilization is but the product of the past, we can readily apprehend that the process of improvement must have been tardy and difficult in proportion to the distance of time which separates us from the period under contemplation. * * Discoveries have been too few and indecisive to afford us any distinct image of the habits and mode of life which characterized this primordial condition of our race; but it is gratifying to add, that a discovery has at length been made which seems to lead in that direction, and which is the more important, inasmuch as it has given a renewed impulse to explorations of the same kind."

The writer then proceeds to give an account of the finding of the remains of cave-dwellers near Aurignac, in the department of the Upper Garonne. Lartet visited the spot and made a careful examination. He found in the bed of the earth which covered the floor of the cavern, bones of the cave bear, the aurochs, the horse, reindeer, &c., which had neither been broken or gnawed; also instruments of flint-stone; a weapon, constructed of the antlers of the reindeer, which had been sharpened at one end, and eighteen small disks, formed of a white shelly substance (fragments of the cockle), perforated in the middle. Bones found on the terrace, in front of the grotto, had all been fractured, as if to lay bare the marrow. The notches made by the stone hatchets or knives, were distinctly to be seen. Among these bones, the following were recognized: the mammoth, rhinoceros, gigantic deer, great bear, tiger, and hyena of the caves, all extinct

species; and, among those still existing, those of aurochs, horse, ass, stag, reindeer, roe, boar, &c. A number of instruments were also found on this terrace; a hearth and evidences of fire. The mouth of the cavern, at the time it was discovered, was closed with a large flat stone, and the whole was covered, as the writer says, by "the rubbish (debris) which for hundreds of thousands of years had been descending from the summit of the hill." Lartet has drawn the following conclusions from these facts: "The burial place of Aurignac reaches back to the highest antiquity of our race; a proof of which is furnished by the fauna found on the site, and which, in part, has long disappeared from the earth. The depth of the layer of ashes, as well as the great number of animal bones, show, that in front of this grotto *funeral feasts* were held, *and that it has been opened at different times to receive new bodies* until the cavity was filled. On the other hand, the uninjured bones found in the interior of the cave, *evince that offerings have been here consecrated to the dead*. The various implements were deposited, *that the deceased might avail themselves thereof on entering upon another life*." Seventeen skulls were found in this grotto; but no fragments of pottery, showing the remote antiquity of the remains. Lyell remarks upon these, that, if rightly interpreted, "we have, at last, succeeded in tracing back the sacred rites of burial, and, more interesting still, a belief in a future state, to times long anterior to those of history and tradition."

Here, then, according to the testimony of the scientists, and those who believe in the great antiquity of man, the earliest traces we find of him, show us, at the same time, that he believed in a future state, and, as a necessary consequence, had some idea of an indwelling incorporeal existence. If the *odium antitheologicum* were not so strong, the facts in this case might remind these scientists of an incident recorded in one of the books of Moses: "And Abraham stood up and bowed himself to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth. And he communed with them, saying: If it be your mind that I should bury my dead out of my sight, hear me, and entreat for me to Ephron the son of Zohar, that he may

give me *the cave* of Macpelah, which he hath, which is in the end of his field; for as much money as it is worth he shall give it me, for a possession of a *burying-place* among you."

Abraham was a stranger among the children of Heth, yet he followed the same custom of burying the dead in caves that they did; which shows us that it was not a local custom, but common throughout the east. And now we learn from facts before us, that the ancient inhabitants of the Upper Garonne followed the same custom, and, like Abraham, believed in a future state. Are these coincidents of no value; are the evidences derived from the religious beliefs of widely different tribes at the present day, showing the same thing, and pointing to the same conclusion, of no value? Is the evidence derived from an examination of the earliest religious ideas of the nations of earth, which points to the same conclusion, of no value? Must all be cast aside as worthless, because they cannot be reconciled with Mr. Darwin's theory of development.

If the religious conditions of the various nations and tribes of the earth, at the present time, teach us any thing, they show that the religious status of the race before dispersion, was higher than that of the lower tribes at the present day. If the early history of the religious idea among the older nations, teaches any truth, it shows that before the dispersion the religious rites were simple, that there was a belief in one, or a chief, omnipotent, invisible Deity; in an immortal soul, and a future state. If the earliest remains of man and his customs show us any thing in regard to his religious status, they show us a belief in invisible agencies, in an immortal nature, and in a future state.

If all these taken together, prove any thing, it is that the lower savage tribes are all, without a single exception, in a degenerate state, so far as their religious ideas are concerned; that their remote ancestors, while yet gathered round the original birth-place, had already arrived at a belief in a supreme, invisible Being; that they believed man was possessed of a spiritual nature, and that they looked beyond the grave with hopes of a happier existence. Therefore all these facts stand

in direct opposition to the theory as applied to man; and if we are governed by the evidence we have, we must reject it.*

We will present one more objection to the theory as applied to man, which we deem of more importance than any other brought forward. It is, that this hypothesis is incompatible with the idea of an immortal soul.

There are but three positions in regard to this point which it is possible for the advocates of the theory of development to assume; first, that man's existence ends with the death of the body; second, that development applies only to the physical nature, the soul being a new creation; third that the soul comes into existence through the law of development.

If the first is assumed, then the Christian world is right in its charge, that the theory is opposed to religion, and that it contradicts the belief which all nations have held from the earliest traces of man's existence down to the present time. If it is admitted that this must be the necessary result of this hypothesis, we have no further reason to argue the question; the world must forever give up its most cherished hopes, and we must admit we are but brute beasts, living, dying and becoming extinct; or we must wholly reject it as incompatible with our self-consciousness. What a cold and lifeless view of man is this; that the glittering but inanimate particle of sand which rolls on in its emotionless existences, should behold—as it were—generation after generation of noble beings, with far-reaching powers of mind, arise from the dust, live a brief space, and then dissolving, like the airy phantom of a dream, sink back to earth, extinct and forgotten in the broad universe. It were better to be a rolling pebble, washed from shore to shore, now sinking deep in a watery grave, now rising high on the mountain crest, yet living on, a pebble still. Such a materialistic view of man, would make earth but a mighty stage, on which God exhibits his creative power and skill, for the amusement of himself or other beings; where the same scene of birth, misery, and death, is being

*We would call attention here to the remarkable words of Paul, Rom. 1: 18—32.

continually enacted. How unworthy of God and man is such a view as this.

The second view supposes a second creation, or rather continued creations, and is directly in conflict with the hypothesis of evolution—it is an admission of its inability to account for the production of man. It requires a double creation to one species, or to each individual—for this view may be that after the species has reached a certain status, the soul is made a specific character; or that a soul is created for each individual—thus destroying the simplicity of the theory. A resort to this expedient to sustain the theory, is a virtual abandonment of it—for it is as reasonable to suppose a second or third creation at any other point in the ascending scale; and it is far more reasonable to suppose man's entire nature to be a separate and distinct creation, thus confirming the Holy Scriptures. The theory must reach through the scale to the last round; the advocate of it must maintain that the whole of man, physical, mental, and moral, has been developed from a lower form, or, so far as man is concerned, it must fall to the ground.

This is evidently the position taken by Mr. Darwin, in the work under consideration, and although it brings him to a hiatus, across which it can never bear him, yet it is more consistent than either of the other views. Let us, therefore, examine it and see if it will stand the test of reason.

Mr. Darwin presents the following challenge: "I am aware that the conclusions arrived at in this work will be denounced by some as highly irreligious, *but he who thus denounces them is bound to show why it is more irreligious to explain the origin of man as a distinct species by descent from some lower form, through the laws of variation and natural selection; than to explain the birth of the individual through the laws of ordinary reproduction.*"*

The italics are our own, and we desire to call attention to the language, as we accept the challenge.

Any belief that can properly be called a religious belief,

*Desc. Man. II. 378.

must embrace the doctrines of a future state and individual immortality, or the immortality of the soul. This Mr. Darwin indirectly admits.* Therefore it follows that a theory which is incompatible with the idea of the immortality of the soul, is more irreligious than the one that is not—the two being equal in other respects. It will be conceded that immortality, as used in this connection, has no meaning, unless it applies to the individual; unless it signifies the immortality of each individual soul. If the hypothesis of development applies to the soul, it must be upon the same principles that it applies to the instinct of animals, and to man's physical nature; for to suppose a change, is virtually giving up one theory and introducing another; and if a change of the law is admitted, we may with equal propriety carry back this change to man's origin, and we are then just where we started.

The origin of the soul, we know, is a difficult question under any theory; and we are aware that there are points connected with it which we cannot explain; this is conceded; but life itself is yet an unsolved mystery. We state it as our opinion, that the soul is born of the parent as well as the body; but how, we cannot say, nor can we say when it becomes an immortal entity in the child, but exactly the same difficulty arises under Mr. Darwin's theory, or any other theory of development as applied to man in his entirety. There is, however, one difference largely in favor of the idea that man is not developed from a lower form; but that he was in the beginning endowed with all his elements of being. It is this: being made subject to the law that like produces like, and his powers of reproduction embracing the soul as well as body, the element of immortality passes to his offspring; and, like many other parts of his nature, arising in the individual at a certain stage of its development. How this arises in the new being, it is true, remains unaccounted for, as it is impossible for us to imagine that immortality appears by degrees; it is also difficult to determine how individual life arises, and, as we have already said, Mr. Darwin's theory is encumbered

**Desc. of Man.* I. 65, and II. 378.

with the same difficulty. But there is another formidable objection that applies to the theory of development, which does not attach to the opposite view. Reason, or any other other faculty, may be possessed in a greater or less degree, but the property (if we may so term it) of immortality is not subject to gradations; it is an entirety that is not subject to subdivision. If immortality is not acquired in the individual as an entirety, the existence of the soul, as well as of the physical nature, is not attained, a new individual life is not completed; in other words, if reproduction, in man, does not produce the soul with immortality, it does not produce the individual. But, in Mr. Darwin's system, the case is quite different; the specific characters are developed by minute gradations, but the individuals attain their complete form; the character of immortality is acquired gradually, natural selection in each generation bringing it nearer and nearer to the maximum. Hence we must suppose, in accordance with this theory, that although individual life and functions are complete, yet immortality is, or was, but partially developed, which involves a manifest absurdity. Lest we may not be clearly understood, let us state this in a somewhat different form.

Specific characters, according to Mr. Darwin, are developed by natural selection from small variations, through a long series of generations; immortality is a specific character, therefore immortality is developed from a small variation through a long series of generations. Hence one generation must possess a minute immortality, the next a little greater immortality, and so on, to the maximum; but the maximum is eternity, hence it will take eternity for its complete development. The tendency to lengthen the term of the existence of the soul, produces at first a little longer life, this is gradually extended in each succeeding generation; this idea only is compatible with the theory. Are we, then, to believe that there are souls passing across the boundary line between the seen and the unseen world, with high hopes of eternal life and happiness, that will, after a few cycles have rolled their rounds, cease to exist? Are we to believe the walks of the

future life will be lined by an endless series of spiritual graves?

If the law of natural selection requires centuries after centuries to develop the power of speech, certainly it cannot span the length of eternity with life at one leap.

We are, therefore, compelled to believe that Mr. Darwin's theory of development by natural selection, or any other theory of development, as applied to man, is inconsistent with the Christian religion, and also with any other religion that embraces in its system the idea of the immortality of the soul.

In closing we present the following as the summary of our view on these questions.

That specific characters of animals and vegetables—as at present limited—are permanent, and reach back to original creations, we admit is doubtful; there are many reasons to cause us to hesitate before asserting this dogmatically.

That all animals have not been developed from one primordial form, we think is evident. The truth, in all probability, lies somewhere between these two extremes.

That natural selection, alone, will not account for the development of specific and other characters, we think is clear.

That man was brought into being by a distinct creative act; and that, taking his whole being into consideration, he cannot be classed as a species, or even family, of the animal kingdom, we are compelled to believe, the opinion of naturalists to the contrary notwithstanding.

The idea thrown out by Geoffroy St. Hilaire in "*Hist. Nat. des Regnes Organiques*," is probably the correct one; that the human family is a distinct kingdom. If we adopt this idea, then we have a beautifully ascending scale in the terrestrial creation, which may be stated substantially as follows: inorganic matter, with one element of being; the vegetable kingdom, with two elements of being; the animal kingdom, with three elements of being; and the human kingdom, with four elements of being; the last forming the link between matter and spirit, capable of existence on either side of the boundary which separates the two worlds.

ARTICLE III.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By C. A. HAY, D. D., Prof. in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

It should not surprise us that the Scriptures so frequently allude to the altered relations of those who have been born again of the Holy Ghost, through the truth, and thus transferred from a state of nature into a state of grace. This change radically affects, not only their own character and conduct, but also their relations to those by whom they are surrounded. After his conversion, as before it, "no man liveth to himself." The wicked are not, cannot be, isolated; the righteous dare not make hermits of themselves. Fellowship of some kind is a necessity for us, as human beings.

How wonderful is the change, in this respect, that takes place in conversion! It involves the sundering of all the ties of sinful associations, and the entrance upon the relations of amity and good-will, of cordial fellowship indeed, with those who were heretofore alienated in character and opinions. It makes enemies of friends and friends of enemies.

The term usually employed in the Scriptures to designate this newly formed relation of the believer, is *κοινωνία*,* *communion*. They describe it as a *relation of the believer, most intimate and endearing, with God and with all his fellow-Christians*. "Truly our fellowship, *κοινωνία*, is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ." 1 Jno. 1 : 3. "And the fellowship, *κοινωνία*, of the Holy Ghost be with you all." 2 Cor. 13 : 13. "If we walk in the light, we have fellowship, *κοινωνίαν*, one with another." 1 Jno. 1 : 7.

*From *κοινός*, (*common, shared alike by all*,) and signifying, in classical as well as in scriptural usage, *participation, communion, fellowship*; and sometimes, in an active sense, *communication or distribution*.

But the same precious truth is set forth, also, in the use of a great variety of similar terms and phrases, exhibiting clearly the great importance attached to this element of Christian character and life, both by our Lord himself and by all his early followers. "If any man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." Jno. 14 : 23. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. 3 : 16. "And ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant." Heb. 12 : 22.

With God, the believer's *fellowship* is represented as one of love. "We love him, because he first loved us." It is set forth as an interchange of paternal and filial affection: "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called sons of God." Yea; he that "calls us to glory and virtue," makes us also "partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

With his fellow-*christians*, the believer's *fellowship* is all-comprehensive, reaching through the whole compass of religious experience, and identifying him with them in all that constitutes the hidden life of godliness and the outward manifestations of the same in doing and suffering for Jesus' sake. It is a fellowship of *kindred*: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." It is a fellowship of *service*: "One is your Master, ye are all brethren." It is a fellowship of *life from the dead*: "Dead in trespasses and sins," he has been awakened with them to newness of life, and enjoys, with them, the healthful pulsations of a life hid with Christ in God. It is a fellowship of *spiritual nourishment*: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion [*κοινωνία*, fellowship,] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion, [*κοινωνία*, fellowship,] of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and

one body ; for we are all partakers of that one bread." 1 Cor. 10 : 26 sq. It is a fellowship of *faith* : "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." It is a fellowship of *suffering* and of *sympathy* : "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." "Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it—or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." It is a fellowship of *access unto the throne of grace* : "By him [Christ] we both [Jews and Gentiles] have access by one Spirit unto the Father." It is a fellowship of *spiritual citizenship* : "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God." It is a fellowship of *fraternal solicitude* : "The members should have the same care one for another." It is a fellowship of *self-sacrificing beneficence* : "Moreover brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia ; how that, in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power, I bear record, yea and beyond their power, they were willing of themselves ; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints." And so it is further a fellowship of *victory over sin*, of *liberty in the gospel*, of *toil*, of *fears*, of *aims*, of *hopes*, yea, of *glorious and assured prospects* reaching out into an *eternal communion of unmingled and uninterrupted felicity*.

Such is the scriptural representation of the *Communion of Saints*. The sacred narrative abounds in evidences of the heartiness with which its privileges were enjoyed, and of the cheerful readiness with which its associated duties were performed, in those days when the Christian life was fresh and vigorous.

Here we find the explanation, too, of that phenomenon that constituted one of the distinguishing features of the life of the earliest Christian churches, namely, the community of goods among believers. This was an extreme illustration of fellowship, that, under ordinary circumstances, cannot be

considered as either prudent or practicable. But the essential constituent in it, the life-force that originated it, was eminently Christian, and, in its elements, is now, as it ever has been, an indispensable feature of every true Christian character. "This grace also" continued to be cultivated during the apostolic age, and has always come into the foreground whenever the Church, in whole or in part, has been aroused from a state of lethargic indifference into something like her primitive vigor and vitality.

To assert this great doctrine and fact, of genuine Christian fellowship, as one of supreme importance, in view as well of its doctrinal as of its practical significance, we understand to have been the design of those who inserted the clause "[I believe in] *the communion of saints*," into the Apostles' Creed.* They meant to teach that the Holy Ghost, in applying the truth to the minds of men, and awakening faith in their hearts, brings them thereby into the Christian Church, and thus introduces them into altogether new relations towards all other beings, into a fellowship most precious and pleasing and profitable.

This clause, in the words of Bishop Pearson, is equivalent to the declaration: "I am fully persuaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit: that beside the external fellowship which they have in the word and sacraments with all the members of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the saints on earth as the living members of Christ: nor is this union separated by

*It is well known that this clause does not appear in the Creed before the end of the fourth century.—Müller, *Die Symbolischen Bücher*, introd. p. 39 sq.

the death of any, but as Christ, in whom they live, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so they have fellowship with all the saints which from the death of Abel have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.”*

Holding this to be the originally intended signification of the clause, “*the communion of saints*,” we regret to find our-

**Pearson on the Creed*, New York, 1843, p. 537.

“As the Spirit, wherever he dwells, manifests himself as the Spirit of truth, of love, and of holiness, it follows that those in whom he dwells must be one in faith, in love and holy obedience. Those whom he guides, he guides into the knowledge of the truth, and as he cannot contradict himself, those under his guidance must, in all essential matters, believe the same truths. And as the Spirit of love, he leads all under his influence to love the same objects, the same God and Father of all, the same Lord Jesus Christ; and to love each other as brethren. This inward, spiritual union, must express itself outwardly, in the profession of the same faith, in the cheerful recognition of all Christians as Christians, that is, in the communion of saints.”—Rev. Dr. Hodge, *Princeton Review*, January, 1846.

“This article [“the communion of saints”] was intended to express the common interest which all sincere Christians have in the favor of God, the redemption of Christ, the aids of the Holy Spirit, and the enjoyment of Christian privileges; in respect to which, as there was no difference of Jew and Greek, nor of bond and free, according to the declaration of St. Paul; so neither should there be of rich and poor, or any other discrimination, in being subjects of Christian law, and having access to the means of grace. It is also a sentiment full of edification and consolation, that there is a community of interest between saints on earth and those separated from them by death, but looking forward to a reunion with them, and a joint attainment to a joyful resurrection.”—*Bishop White. Lectures on the Catechism of the Prot. Episcopal Church*, Phila. 1813, p. 38.

“Hence we may now understand what we mean when we say, *I believe in the communion of saints*; viz. I believe that all the saints (to the company of whom I am firmly persuaded that I belong) are united to Christ, their head, by his Spirit, and that gifts are bestowed upon them from the head, including such as are the same in all and necessary for their salvation, as well as those which are diverse and variously bestowed upon every one, and which are requisite for the edification of the Church.”—*Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism*, Columbus, 1851, p. 305.

selves at variance, in this particular, with our own church standards. These, whilst handing down to us this expression as a distinct clause in the Creed, *ἁγίων κοινωνίαν*—*sanctorum communionem*—*Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*—nevertheless take great pains to explain this phrase as merely exegetical of, and synonymous with, the one preceding it. As though it were intended to be read: “the Holy Catholic Church, *i.e.*, the communion of saints.”

The Larger Catechism thus comments upon it: “The Creed calls the Holy Christian Church *communio sanctorum*, *eine Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, a communion of saints, for both taken together signify the same thing. But at first the one clause was not appended, and it is badly and unmeaningly translated *eine Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, a communion of saints. If we were to render it plainly, we would have to express it quite differently in German, for the word *ἐκκλησία* signifies properly in German *eine Versammlung*, a congregation or assemblage. [The Catechism here assumes that *communio* is merely in exegetical apposition to *ecclesia*.] But we are accustomed to the little word *Kirche* [Church] which the illiterate understand to mean not an assembled congregation, but a consecrated house or building; although the house should not be called a church, except because the congregation assembles in it: for we who assemble prepare for ourselves and occupy a certain space, and give to the house a name after the congregation.”

“The word *Church* signifies, therefore, properly speaking, nothing else than a common assemblage, and is etymologically not German, but Greek, (as also is the case with the Latin word *ecclesia*), for they pronounce it *kyria*, as also in the Latin, *curia*. Therefore in our native German language we should render it *eine christliche Gemeinde oder Sammlung*, [a Christian congregation or assembly,] or, best and clearest of all, *eine heilige Christenheit* [a holy christendom].”

“And the word *communio*, that is appended to it, should not be translated *Gemeinschaft* [communion], but *Gemeine* [community, congregation]. And this is nothing else than a gloss or explanation, whereby some one wished to indicate

what the Christian Church was. And this our people, who understood neither Latin nor German, have rendered *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen* [communion of saints]; but this is no true, comprehensible German expression. The true German way of expressing it is, *eine Gemeinde der Heiligen*, [a community of saints,] that is, a congregation in which there are none but holy persons, or, more clearly still, a holy congregation. And I speak thus, so that the words *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen* [communion of saints] may be understood; because they have become so familiar that their use can hardly be prevented, and one is at once suspected of heresy if he changes a single word.*"

Now the word *Gemeinschaft* corresponds very closely to the original *κοινωνία*, *communio*, conveying the idea of *fellowship*, and no better German word can be found to express just what we hold to be the original intention of those who inserted this clause. But Luther did not so understand their design. Believing that they intended merely to define the word *ἐκκλησία* by a synonymous expression, he found this word *Gemeinschaft*, then in use as a translation of *κοινωνία*, an unsuitable term to express what he thought the phrase was intended to mean. And so he labors to push it aside and substitute for it the word *Gemeine*, *congregation* or *community*. One can hardly avoid the impression, however, whilst reading his remarks, given above, that he felt somewhat uneasy in making that change. And it is something quite unusual for us to find him afraid of being "suspected of heresy." We think it would have been better if he had avoided that danger, by suffering the word *Gemeinschaft* to remain, and had understood the Creed to say: "I believe in the communion, that is, the *fellowship* of the saints."

From the graphic description which Luther, in this same

*The Apology, Arts. VII. and VIII. reiterates this exposition of the word *κοινωνία*, *communio*. "This still more clearly and distinctly explains what is meant by the Church, namely the multitude and assemblage of those who confess one gospel, have the same knowledge of Christ, have one Spirit, which renews, sanctifies and controls their hearts."

connection, gives of those who compose the Church of Christ upon earth, we perceive that he was no stranger to the precious scripture doctrine of the *communion of saints*, the true fellowship of believers. He thus continues: "But the meaning and substance of this appended clause is as follows: I believe that there is a little flock and assemblage upon earth of saints alone, under one head, Christ, called together by the Holy Spirit, of one faith, of one mind, of one opinion, with manifold gifts, but harmonious in love, without sects and divisions. Of this I too am a part and a member, a sharer and participator in all the blessings it affords, brought into this relation by the Holy Ghost, and incorporated with it by having heard and still hearing the word of God, whereby we begin to enter the same. For before we enter it we belong to the devil, as those who know nothing of God and of Christ. Thus the Holy Ghost will, until the last day, remain with the Christian Church, or with Christendom, through which he brings us near, and which he employs to preach and apply the word, whereby he creates and increases sanctification, so that it daily advances and becomes stronger in faith and in its works which he produces."

No one who rightly appreciates the nature of Christian fellowship, can fail to recognize, in this description of believers, how thoroughly Luther comprehended the radical nature of the change wrought in them by the Holy Spirit and the preciousness of that communion into which they were thereby introduced. So much the more strange must it then appear that he took such pains to prove that the very word in the Creed, which expresses so distinctly the conception of *fellowship* in all these features of Christian character and life, meant nothing more than *congregation*, or *assemblage*; that this expression: "communion of saints," was not a separate and independent clause in the Creed, but merely a parenthetical definition, merely an echo of the phrase going before, "denn es ist beides einerlei zusammen gefasset," [both, taken together, mean the same thing].

No! Tautological phrases were not thus needlessly interjected into formularies of such significance. No! The clause

was meant to set forth the precious truth that *in this Church* (which is indeed composed of all true believers) there is created and upheld by the Holy Ghost a most precious, intimate and fruit-bearing *fellowship*, both among those who compose it, and between them and the Lord.

Could it, indeed, even be shown that such were not the intention of those who thus amended the Creed, but that they really meant only to introduce an explanatory clause, that fact would in no wise detract from the essential importance and necessity of the fellowship of believers, as so fully taught in the Scriptures and illustrated in the true life of the Church.

But, at the same time, it is not a matter of small moment how we understand this clause in the third article of the Creed, now so familiar to the ear of the Church; whether we degrade it to the level of a mere parenthetical explanation, or hold it to be the assertion of an independent and important article of our most holy faith.

It would seem to be a natural and legitimate inference, that the constant repetition of a phrase, couched in scriptural terms, expressive of Christian fellowship, but understood as merely specifying of whom the Church consists, would tend to interfere with the proper understanding of the same terms as frequently employed in the Scriptures, and thus become a means of obscuring, rather than illustrating, the divine word. Indeed, if we may judge of the practical effect of such an emasculation of the true meaning of this clause upon those who take this superficial view of it, by the actual ecclesiastical attitude and spirit of those who most strenuously insist upon this mode of interpretation, we must conclude that it strongly predisposes them to close their eyes to some of the most precious privileges, and to neglect some of the most important duties of our common Christianity. We see them occupying the unenviable and strangely inconsistent position, of constantly repeating these blessed words, so redolent of true Christian charity: *I believe in the communion of saints*—whilst they, at the same time, cherish an ecclesiastical exclusiveness, that shuts out, not only from ordinary church fel-

lowship, but even from the table of the Lord, the great mass of those whom they themselves will nevertheless acknowledge as entitled to be called "*saints*," i. e., *sincere Christians*. Very much as though they were to say: "*We believe in the communion of saints, but we will not practice it ourselves nor tolerate it in others.*"

Now, in our opinion, this clause was meant to assert and vindicate, *among other things*, the right of all true believers to share in the bountiful provisions offered upon the table of the Lord *whenever and wherever it is spread*. No Christian Church has the right, whilst holding and professing this Creed, to exclude from its communion table any true follower of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is not a mere act of Christian courtesy when we invite all sincere Christians who may be present at our administration of *the holy communion*, to come and partake with us. If we fail to bid them welcome to that which is theirs as much as ours, (for it is the Lord's table, both theirs and ours,) we act with a strange and selfish inconsistency. If we, however, formally and by ecclesiastical enactment, authoritatively exclude them, we do most grievously sin against them, and through them, against our common Lord and Master. We rend the body of Christ. One is our Master, and we are all brethren. We all belong to the household of faith. We expect, hereafter, in heaven, to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, with all the prophets and apostles, with holy martyrs of old, with all these our dear brethren in the faith of the gospel, now serving God acceptably in the various branches of the Christian Church upon earth—we expect to share with all these in the heavenly communion, when our Lord Jesus Christ will drink of that wine new with us in his Heavenly Father's kingdom—and that will be *the perfected communion of saints*.

And the communion of the body and blood of Christ upon earth, is but one, though no doubt the most significant and efficient, means now placed within our reach for exemplifying and developing the spirit of true Christian fellowship. Alas for those who so egregiously pervert it by actually trans-

forming it into a symbol of sectarianism and an engine of bigotry.

Let us all learn not only intelligently to profess and heartily to believe in, but also to practice, the COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

ARTICLE IV.

JOHN KEPLER, THE GERMAN ASTRONOMER.

Translated from the German. by Rev. C. B. THÜMMEL, Dixon, Ill.

It is only within this century that John Kepler has found suitable biographers; a fact which, considering his great industry in his favorite science, and his eventful life, so full of interest, is the more singular, since it concerns a Protestant and a highly patriotic character; in his moral views firm as a rock, in whom the latest posterity will rejoice, not with wonder and admiration merely, but with heartfelt love and affection.

The childhood of Kepler furnishes a gloomy picture of a dark period. The 27th of December, 1571, was the day on which, a weakly babe, he was born. The place of his birth is somewhat doubtful, so much so, that, after his death, three places in Suabia contested the honor of having given birth to him; and even to this day, in spite of many pamphlets written on the subject, it remains a mooted point, whether Weil, a free city of the old Germanic empire, or a neighboring hamlet, called Magstadt, is the place of his birth. The family relations which influenced his education during the first years of his childhood, were disturbed and unfriendly. His father, Henry Kepler, soon after John's birth, left his home, and, though a Protestant, entered as a soldier the service of Alba, who with bloody, fanatical barbarity tried to crush the revolt of the Netherlands. His wife, Catharine, a harsh and quarrelsome woman, gave their only child, John,

to his grand-parents, and followed her husband to the war. Returned in 1575 the family kept tavern somewhere in Baden; but the restless spirit of soldiering again took possession of the husband. In 1589 he again left home, enlisted and met his end in the war against the Turks. The brothers of John inherited the unstable disposition of their father, and lost that filial love for the mother, which so distinguished our celebrated astronomer and his sister, Margaret.

The bodily weakness of John, as a boy, induced his parents to keep him away from severe labor in the field and to send him to the convent-schools, Hirschau and Maulbron, which had then become Protestant institutions. On account of his early distinguishing himself in learning, it was decided to give him a professional education, and, in 1589, he was admitted into the Theological Seminary (Stift) at Tübingen. Tübingen was at that time the chief seat of narrow-hearted Lutheran orthodoxy. The Form of Concord had here its most ardent defenders in men like Andreae, Herbrand, and others. The worthy Professor of Mathematics, Philip Apian, had been expelled from there a few years before, because his views did not agree with the Form of Concord. His place was filled by Michael Maestlin, the teacher of Kepler, who, *ex officio*, had to teach the system Ptolemy, but did not leave his pupils in the dark regarding the Copernican system, to which he himself adhered. Maestlin was, however, of a diffident nature, and cannot be compared, either in manliness or in science, with his great pupil, though Kepler ever cherished for him a faithful attachment.

The sturdy manliness which, in his riper years, made Kepler so much admired, displayed itself in him already when a student at the University. He rejected the bodily presence of Christ in the Holy Supper, and energetically defended his views in an essay which he presented to his teachers. In it he wrote: "I respect in all the three Christian Churches that which I find agreeing with the word of God; but I protest just as much against new doctrines as against old heresis." Through this he, however, lost the favor of his instructors, and was discovered to be unfit to become a co-laborer with

them in the church in Wurtemberg, and in his testimonials his talent as an orator alone was mentioned with praise. The first opportunity of getting rid of him was seized upon, and, entirely against his will, he was sent to Gratz as instructor in Mathematics. Having been educated at the expense of the Seminary in Tübingen, he did not wish to be ungrateful and refractory, and therefore yielded, reserving for himself, however, the right of a situation in the Church of his native land. But, after he had once been torn away from his theological atmosphere, and had deeply entered upon mathematics and astronomy, the desire of ever returning to the bickerings of theologians left him, concerning which he sharply expressed himself thus: "To the follies of this world I count the spirit of persecution, which rules in all religious denominations, the notion, which every one of them entertains, that its cause is the cause of God; it alone, therefore, enjoys the privilege of salvation; the arrogant assumption of theologians, that they alone possess the right of interpreting the Scriptures, and that blind faith must be reposed in them, even though their interpretations are contrary to sound reason; finally, the audacity with which them condemn those who make use of their evangelical liberty."

In the year 1593, Kepler entered upon his duties as Professor of Mathematics and Moral Philosophy in the Gymnasium at Gratz. His first official labor was to prepare an Almanac for 1594, in which, in accordance with the usages of the times, prophecies of the weather and of important events to occur during the year, had to be inserted. Fortune favored him; his prophecies of a very severe winter and of rebellious movements among the peasantry, happened to come true, and secured him fame and a believing circle of auditors, and in this way his delight in investigating the secrets of nature was kindled and augmented. That he was ever ready to acknowledge real merit, even in an opponent, he manifested by his vigorous defence of the Gregorian Calendar, which, because it had not been produced by a Protestant ecclesiastic, but by the Pope's astronomer, had been obstinately rejected by the Protestant Estates.

In a few years already his studies and researches had so far progressed, that he published his "*Mysterium Cosmographicum*." His enthusiasm for Harmony in Nature found in this work this most eloquent utterance. "As delicacies are eaten for dessert, thus wise souls acquire a taste for heavenly things, when from their earthly tabernacle they rise up to the universe and look abroad in the same. He who here below has discovered the vanity of human affairs, will be ready to soar from earth up towards heaven. They are happy to whom it was permitted first to do this—happy souls who ascended up to heaven. Such will begin to place less value upon that which once appeared excellent. They will esteem above all the works of God, and find pure enjoyment in their contemplation. Thou great Architect of the universe, with admiration I behold the works of Thy hands, built after five ingenious forms; in their midst the sun, dispenser of light and of life, which, after unalterable laws, bridles the earth and directs in its various course. I behold the changes of the moon and stars scattered over the immense vault of heaven. Thou Father of the world, what moved Thee thus to exalt a feeble creature of the dust, to raise him so high, that he stands, a king ruling far and wide, almost a God, for he can follow and search out Thy thoughts and designs."

The study of his whole life, viz.: to reduce the phenomena of nature to simple, general laws, he already expressed in his *Mysterium* with great clearness. "The organism of the world must be kept in motion by powers simple and co-operating; here, as in all nature, unity in variety must rule. With astronomy natural philosophy (physics) must be united; the one must be explained by the other."

The years which Kepler spent in Gratz were the happiest of his life. To the satisfaction which the success of his investigations afforded, a distinguished and agreeable position in civil life was added. Here he found Barbara, his loving wife, a daughter of the wealthy family von Muhleck. In the year 1597 the wedding took place, which resulted in a happy domestic life. The property which Barbara brought him, appeared sufficient to secure Kepler independence; when sud-

denly the demon of darkness hurled him from his state of enjoyment into dependence and misery.

The fanaticism of Duke Ferdinand of Steyermark, who just then had assumed the government of his estates, and was afterwards known as the Emperor Ferdinand II., had been fanned into a burning flame by his pilgrimage to Rome. He had returned to his dominions with the sworn resolve to drive away all heretics, and seized upon the first opportunity to execute his design.

His first order, issued with this intent, was the command to all the Protestant teachers in Gratz, within a fortnight, to leave the lands of the Duke. With Kepler it fared at first better than with his associates. The Jesuits were in hopes of using his talents and science for their interest, and therefore procured for him temporary permission to return to Graz. Their order had no surer means of extending its influence in China, than by arranging the Chinese chronology, which had become somewhat confused, and for this they needed a skilful astronomer. By all possible means, therefore, the Jesuits sought to gain Kepler over to their interests, at first by brilliant offers of promotion; next that only in secret he should have to become a Catholic, but not change his profession in public; and, finally, that he should be allowed to believe what he pleased, without let or hindrance, provided he would unite with their order. But all their sneaking overtures were repelled by the moral courage and unyielding character of Kepler, who replied: "I am a Christian; I have received the Augsburg Confession from parental instruction, from repeated careful examination, and proved it in daily temptations; to it I adhere; I have not learned to be a hypocrite; matters of faith are treated by me as things of serious import, not as playthings." Forbearance towards him was now at an end. In the Duke's letter of protection, Kepler's remaining in Gratz had been conditioned on his due discretion and faultless behavior. The Jesuits now declared these conditions to have been broken, and Kepler was forthwith ordered, within forty-five days, to leave the country. He had to rent out the lands of his wife for a trifle, and left the city.

About this time (1600) the invitation of Tycho Brahe, who had settled in Prague, again reached him, and was welcomed most gladly. Kepler, with his family, removed to Prague, and assisted Tycho in preparing the Prutenic tables, for which labor the salary granted him at Gratz was continued. The character of the Danish astronomer appears to have given rise to many misunderstandings, and his money matters were so sadly neglected by the imperial officers, that he was not able to pay to his associate such sums as were necessary for his household expenses. To put an end to this intolerable situation, Kepler again entered into correspondence with Tübingen, but found the authorities there hardly more tolerant than those in Gratz. They were unwilling to give him a call by reason of the difference of his views from those of the Form of Concord.

In October, 1601, however, Tycho Brahe died, and Kepler succeeded him as Astronomer to the Emperor's Court. Now begins the time of his immortal discoveries. Of celebrated treatises and essays, in which he published his new ideas and fruitful observations, there appeared, during this period, his "*Paralipomena ad Vitellionem*, 1604," in which he already speaks of the division of a sunbeam into its seven colors; "*the Treatise on the Comets*, 1607"—of the many important hypotheses contained in it, we mention only this one, that the comets do not belong to the solar system, but to the universe, and visit the sun but once in a parabola or hyperbola, without ever again returning—"Dioptrica, 1611," in which he already describes the construction of the telescope with two convex lenses, which, alas, found then no optician to make it, and lastly the chief of his works: "*Astronomia nova, seu physica cœlestis, tradita commentariis de motibus stellæ, Martis*, 1609," with the first and second great laws of Kepler.

Kepler's domestic affairs no longer continued as favorable as they had been at Gratz. In the year 1611, Barbara, his loving wife, died, and in the same year he lost three children by the small-pox. The empty state of the emperor's treasury caused him often to suffer bitter want. Already in the year

1607, when the emperor Rudolphus was deposed, the sum of four thousand guilders salary was due him; during the reign of his successor, Matthias, this sum had increased to twelve thousand guilders, of which hardly any amount was paid. Even the acknowledgment of the justice of his demands by the Diet at Regensburg, in 1613, brought no relief, so that Kepler was at last under the necessity of accepting a Professorship in the Gymnasium at Linz, which was offered him by the Estates of Upper Austria.

Two happy years were here spent by the industrious savan. Shortly after commencing his duties there, he entered into a second marriage with Susannah Rottinger, from Effertingen, in Austria, to give a mother to his orphaned children. A happy wedlock blessed him with seven children.

His first residence in Linz continued till 1620. It gave him leisure to devote himself to his astronomical researches, and two of his most finished works were here written, viz.: "Epitome Astronomiæ Copernicanæ, 1668," a defence of the Copernican system by means of his (Kepler's) latest discoveries, and "Harmonice Mundi, 1619," with the choice pearl of Kepler's third great law.

Meanwhile the great thirty years' war had burst forth, and the situation of the Protestants in Austria, under Ferdinand, just then crowned emperor, became very unsafe and doubtful. Yet Kepler rejected the invitation of king James to come to England. "Shall I," said he, "go across the sea whither king James invites me? I, a German, a friend of the main land? I, with my feeble wife and brood of children?" Just as little would he accept the Professorship of Mathematics at Bologna, for the fate of the astronomer, Bruno, burnt in 1600, rendered him suspicious of papal Universities.

We have now to turn to an event in Kepler's life so sad, that the pen refuses to write a narrative of it. It is the trial as a witch, instituted against his mother in her native land.

This aged dame, then living in Leonberg, near Weil in Wurtemberg, did not enjoy the good will of her neighbors. It was perhaps justly attributed to her disposition, that her

husband had left his home and enlisted in the war against the Turks. In those days, a lone old dame might, by means of the least trifle, incur the suspicion of witchcraft; and when this suspicion had once been raised against Catharine Kepler, all the ills happening in the town where she resided, were attributed to her. Being a busybody, she had gained entrance into many houses and families, and by means of unsuccessful attempts at conjuring and unwholesome cordials and nostrums, hatred and suspicion were so far augmented, that in a quarrel between her and a friend of her younger years, the aid of the court was to be brought into requisition, on a charge of witchcraft. The principal family of her opponents, Reinbold by name, had managed to gain over to its side the Judge of Leonberg, Luther Einhorn, a person as stupidly fanatical as he was without conscience. He took up their cause with energy, and, by dint of horrid tortures, had extorted from other persons, also accused of witchcraft, the confession that dame Kepler belonged to their sisterhood, when in his brutal zeal he so far overstepped his bounds, that the son and son-in-law of Catharine instituted a slander suit, not indeed against him, but against his abettors. After this critical step had been taken, the astronomer in Linz was informed of the affair. In his letter, written immediately to the magistracy of Leonberg, he points out the inconsistency of the judge's proceedings, and closes with these words: "It is my resolve to defend my mother to the hazard of my life and property, and with the aid of my friends and patrons, and I shall not rest till I have brought her case to an end by judicial procedure."

Einhorn, and the party to which he was allied, likewise made the utmost exertions. The slander suit was protracted, finally set entirely aside, and in spite of the exertions of pastor Binder, the son-in-law, and Christopher Kepler, the son, could not again be brought into court. Meanwhile every means was employed to obtain fresh materials for the witch trial, women of doubtful reputation were induced to cultivate acquaintance with Mrs. Kepler, in order afterwards to testify against her. The evidence of children, twelve or thirteen

years old, was received as valid by the judge; on the other hand, he would admit no testimony in her favor, and extracted from the proceedings, for his report to the superior judge, that which best suited his purpose, thus gaining authority from that judge to commence the witch trial.

Dame Kepler had meanwhile complied with the invitation of her son, and gone to Linz, to escape the persecutions of the brutal judge. A letter of the astronomer, who forthwith warmly undertook the defence, to the Duke of Wurtemberg, had at least the result of showing that the proceeding of the superior judge had been too hasty. Kepler engaged lawyers to defend the cause of his mother, who, influenced by her relations in Wurtemberg, returned to Leonberg, but was soon after incarcerated and loaded with chains, though she at length succeeded in removing the trial from Leonberg to the neighboring village of Gueglingen. But Aulber, the judge of that village, won over by Einhorn, proceeded in the trial altogether under the assumption, that every means was to be used to bring the accused to the stake.

In 1620 John Kepler himself arrived at Gueglingen, and in the first place tried to revive the slander suit, but in vain, and during the whole of the next year he was incessantly occupied to prove the innocence of his mother. To the ill-concealed anger of the opposite party, he had effected that, in consideration of her distinguished son, the trial of his aged mother was to be carried on with moderation, and the threat of torture should not be carried out. After the use of the instruments of torture had been minutely explained to the seventy years' old dame, and she had been urged once more to confess her crime, she firmly declared her innocence, fell on her knees, and prayed the Lord's prayer. Thereupon her innocence was declared, and she was set at liberty. The worthy deportment of the aged dame closed, like a harmonizing chord, a life full of discords; she died soon after.

The trial ended, Kepler went again to reside at Linz. His chief occupation at this time was to make the calculations for his edition of the Rudolphic Tables. He was allowed further residence in Linz for this very purpose; now and then

a little money was likewise paid to him, yet he was always in straitened circumstances. For the sake of his daily bread he was compelled to write almanacs, of little value, horoscopes and prognostications, and to work at his Tables as time would permit. In the year 1627, these tables were finally published at Ulm, in Wurtemberg, and procured for him once more a moderate income from copies sold.

With the completion of the Tables the permission of his residing in Linz also ceased. Everywhere in Germany the torch of war was burning, and no quiet haven seemed to open for Kepler. Then ensued his correspondence with that mighty general, whose court at Lagan appeared in the end to furnish the most secure retreat for the sorely tried astronomer. Wallenstein undertook the payment of the salary still due him, hoping to gain the first astronomer in the world for his astrological propensities. But Kepler was not the man to give up, or even to conceal his views and opinions at the whim of a powerful prince. With his acquirements it would have been easy for him to impose upon Wallenstein's superstitions, and to turn him at his will; but Kepler pursued with firmness the even tenor of true science. The sober-minded, deep thinker, and the superstitious, great warrior, never became intimate. An offer of the Duke to come to Rostock the astronomer made to depend on the prompt payment of the salary due him.

Thus their separation was brought about. In 1630 Kepler hastened to Regensburg to claim his just dues at the diet there assembled, but sank under the fatigues of the journey a few days after his arrival. On the 15th of November, 1630, the bold thinker, the acute calculator, the straightforward, upright man, departed this life, and left to the world, as the results of his life, the foundations of the stately edifice of modern astronomy. So long as astronomy itself shall have a name among men, the name of this renowned German will be counted amongst the most famous. The immortality of his name, the admiration of his genius, are the only thanks which posterity can bring him. May they never be withheld! Many of his contemporaries have, indeed, paid him

the tribute of honor and admiration; some have given him proofs of friendship; but the two great religious parties appear to have vied with each other, which of them could harass him the most.

Pushed aside by the Protestants, driven out by the Catholics, by Protestants threatened with the burning of his mother as a witch, defrauded by the Catholics of the salary he had so richly earned, it might have been difficult even for Kepler himself to say which of them had carried off the victory and grieved him the most.

Fate seems to have delighted in presenting in his life the sharpest contrarieties. Declared by the consistory to be unworthy of serving a fanatical orthodoxy, he became an astronomer and mathematician of immortal fame. Whilst it had become the great problem of his life to reduce the most complicated phenomena of nature to their simplest laws, he was forced for a time to lay aside his studies to save his mother from being burned as a witch at the stake.

That Kepler died of starvation has luckily been proved to be a myth, for among his effects, after his death, was found a sum of money sufficient to keep him from starving. But that myth is of great significance for Kepler's whole course of life; he had incessantly to struggle for his daily bread.

ARTICLE V.

SOURCES OF POWER IN PREACHING.

By the Rev. CHAS. A. STORK, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

Dr. J. W. Alexander, in one of his Homiletical Paragraphs, remarks on the advantage Methodist preachers have over their Presbyterian brethren, from their habitual choice in preaching of the great themes of the Bible, such as the Judgment, Hell, the Crucifixion, the Deluge, the intended sacrifice of Isaac, the parable of Lazarus. The whole paragraph is

full of suggestion of the most wholesome sort to young preachers, and especially to scholarly men. The more cultivated the taste and the deeper the sensibility to the great things of religion, the more will the preacher shrink from handling these striking themes. He feels how inadequate his treatment of them must be, and in his excessive modesty and self-consciousness, forgets that the power of the pulpit is not, after all, in the peculiar treatment of the theme, but in the theme itself.

But what is specially noticeable in Dr. Alexander's paragraph, is the curious illustration it affords, of how the healthy instincts of spiritual minds reach by a direct path the same methods that philosophy attains by carefully deduced and roundabout processes. The Methodist preachers, of the times of Wesley and Whitefield, chose the great themes of the Bible, Sin, Redemption, the Crucifixion, Resurrection, the Judgment, Hell—not because they had any carefully reasoned theories on the method of preaching, but by a spontaneous impulse. They grasped at them instinctively, as a man in a shipwreck clings to the biggest spar he can find. They wanted to produce immediate and revolutionary effects, and they laid hold of what affected them—Christ on the cross, Christ risen from the tomb, the unrolling scenes of the awful Judgment, the solemn terrors of Hell, the glowing scenery of Heaven. The tradition of this choice, and, we may hope, the same spiritual instinct that prompted this choice, have come down in the succession of the Wesleyan ministry. They were right. The great features of Christianity that differentiate it from all other religions, are the true elements of its power. It overawes, subdues, attracts, not by virtue of what it has in common with other systems of morals, and other faiths, but by what it has peculiar to itself. And it is on these that the great preachers, and not only the great, but also many very rough, narrow and unlettered preachers, who have, nevertheless, exerted great power over men, have always, as by instinct, fixed. The method of the Wesleyan ministry in the days of their power, and the method, too, of all the greatly stirring preachers that have appeared as revival-

ists, evangelist, reformers, in the Church, is the method justified by the profoundest philosophy of religion.

It is the object of this paper, to point out in detail what that method is; and to show how perfectly it is in accord with the best philosophy of Christianity and of human nature.

What are the methods characteristic of the great successful movements in the propagation of Christianity? If we carefully strip away all adventitious circumstances, they will, as it appears to me, be found to be summed up in two brief statements:

I. CHRISTIANITY HAS BEEN PROPAGATED BY THE POWER OF MORAL ENTHUSIASM IN THOSE WHO PREACH IT, RATHER THAN BY ARGUMENT OR EDUCATION.

Wherever the religion of Christ has been greatly aggressive, it has spread and overcome by a species of moral contagion. It preachers have produced conviction, not by their arguments, but by their irresistible confidence and fervor of zeal. Their doctrines have found entrance and lodgment in the hearts of the multitude, not so much by their weight as by their impetus, as the Whitworth bolt penetrates rather through superior velocity than by intrinsic gravity. This is conformable to the structure, so to speak, of the moral and spiritual nature. The conscience apprehends truth only when kindled and fused. All the arguments in the world cannot reach the moral sense that is dull. The plate that is made chemically sensitive retains the impress of the sun's rays: the soul that is made sympathetically sensitive, retains the impress of truth. If you feel yourself, you will make me feel. And the method of Christianity, when most successful, has been to conquer through the moral sensitiveness produced by sympathetic emotion.

The arguments used by Peter on the day of Pentecost were convincing enough when men felt them; but there was nothing in them to make those who had seen the miracles and heard the words of Christ unmoved, cry out, "Men and

brethren, what shall we do?" But Peter was kindled by the enthusiasm of the Holy Ghost: his words were glowing with faith. This risen Jesus was a reality to him. He saw Him. He beheld His exaltation and glory. He exulted in His coming dominion. His voice thrilled with the tenderness of love. Peter was on fire: the fire of faith, and hope, and joy; and it went through the multitude as the flame through the dry prairie. There was a demonstration of the religion he taught; but the demonstration was in Peter himself, not in his syllogisms and inferences. It was a demonstration of the power of God; but the power of God was written where it could be read in letters of human emotion, transformation. And that experience was repeated as often as the preachers of the word told their story. Wherever the evangelist went, repeating the story of which his heart was full, the variations and pondering and fulfilling of which now made up the substance of his life, some who heard him were persuaded and believed, not because they were argued into a corner and submitted to stress of intellectual conviction; but simply because he believed and rejoiced so heartily himself, that they were melted into acquiescence. Every glacier and snow-drift will run to the sea-level, if only it is thawed and set free; and every frozen soul will gravitate to Christ, if once it is melted out of its stupor and torpor and cold obstinacy. Christian fervor and faith melt men. As the heat went from soul to soul, and the glow increased with the pressure of the multitude, the congealed fortresses of paganism in the Roman empire gave way, and Christianity swept over the empire as a flood.

The same phenomenon was repeated, in the Middle Ages, when the great preachers of the monastic orders, burning with a new-kindled fire, made their preaching tours through Europe, or, like Savonarola, concentrated their fiery force on one community. They told the people, who flocked to hear them, the same things they had heard from their childhood; but it was wonderfully new, because the fervor and resistless persuasion that possessed the mind of the preacher radiated

its heat through all that came in contact with him, and melted heart and mind into a state of sympathetic sensitiveness: then the truth fell on their minds as the die on the wax.

When the Reformation burst on Europe, the great preacher was Luther; not because he could argue better than Melancthon; nor because he knew more than Erasmus; but because his soul was like a furnace in which the truths of our holy religion lay as a molten mass, blazing with light, intense with the white heat of irresistible conviction. This made his words like thunderbolts. When he preached there was a summer in all the air, that made men's minds and hearts open, as the buds swell and burst in the bland, wooing days of spring.

Every one familiar with the history of the English Church, knows what human agency it was that brought about the great revival in that Church in the middle of the last century. The Archbishop of Canterbury thought if Mr. Wesley would only leave off preaching his peculiar doctrines of Faith and Redemption, and tell men of plain, practical duties, he would be very useful, and so advised him. Dean Stanley thinks this very good advice, and mildly wonders at the impetuous, irrepressible company that went, following the lead of the Wesleys, converting the heathenism of the English lower classes into the fervors of primitive faith. But it was not the arguments of Wesley and Fletcher and Berridge that made the colliers and peasantry weep and repent and believe, but the faith and love that flamed through their words and shot like electric fire from breast to breast.

The same method of conquest over the obstinacy of unbelief and carelessness, is to be observed in the great religious movements of this day. Our great revivals, as in 1857, and 1869, and 1870, were not the result of any elaborate education or powerful argumentation. An increase of fervor and a manifest intensity of belief characterized the preaching that preceded and accompanied them. Men were not convinced first of the truth of Christianity; but they were convinced of the reality of the faith of those who preached it; and then the gate was opened. Whenever an evangelist like Mr. Ham-

mond appears, persuading, overpowering men of every description wherever he goes, good men begin immediately to puzzle themselves over the question how one so narrow, unlettered, wanting in nearly all the qualifications of what is commonly esteemed a great preacher, can have such power. He cannot argue; he is not eloquent; he has narrow views of truth;—say men—and then they are perplexed. No; truly, he cannot argue; he says nothing new; he is not eloquent; he has no theology; but if he could argue, and had a perfect theology, and was as full of new things as a winter night of stars, all this would not explain his power. One thing does explain it; he is full of faith; he is possessed with an irresistible conviction of the truth of his message; it burns within him; it burns through him; it kindles all the atmosphere about him. He melts the ice of men's indifference by the contact of his fervid faith, and then the waters flow.

It is in proportion as preachers of the gospel are fused themselves by this fire of faith and love, that they are effective in propagating Christianity. Mr. Beecher, in one of his late lectures on preaching, goes so far as to venture on the opinion, that a preacher should act as though he had the feeling, even if he has it not, in order to carry his audience with him. This is unphilosophic as well as immoral, for it is no simulated feeling that melts the heart. Painted fire will do for dramatic representation, but it will not thaw the ice in the audience. It is only the contagion of sympathy caught from the enthusiastic, tender heart, that opens men's souls to religious conviction. The account of the elder Booth's repeating the Lord's Prayer with such dramatic power as to melt a company of ministers to tears, is a very pretty story, but it is neither authentic history nor sound philosophy. But this extravagant over-statement of Mr. Beecher's, only shows the depth of conviction in his own mind, that the true method of the propagation of Christianity, is by moral enthusiasm, spiritual fervor, kindling by contact, rather than by intellectual effects.

M. Taine, in his vivid picture of the great religious awakening that ushered in the Reformation in England, speaks of

the facility with which the common peasant mind grasped the Biblical ideas of God, in his grandeur, solitariness, holiness. Ideas, that to the orderly, logical mind of the Frenchman were incomprehensible, were immediately appropriated by the English yeoman. Why? Because the Englishmen of that generation had brooded over the memories of their martyred companions and brothers, their farewell words, their last pathetic appeals to Christ uttered at the stake, until the whole heart was melted into sympathy, and the imagination was kindled and uplifted. Then the truths of God's word struck deep impressions on the sensitive mind: "They understand it with the imagination and the heart." What the sight of the witnesses at the stake, from their own circle of friends and from the household group, did for those men, the fervid faith and impassioned energy of conviction in the preacher does for his audience in every generation. It softens the obdurate heart and slips in the truth through the open door of sympathy. Whatever, then, fuses the truth in the mind of the preacher, so that he is no longer merely enunciating the members of an argument of which he is intellectually persuaded and is desirous of communicating to his hearers, but has become one with the truth, and pours it forth as the irrepressible outflow of his very being, secures for him the method which is irresistible.

Men talk of a re-adjustment of the methods of the pulpit to the needs of an age advanced in civilization, refined and acute in its habits of thought. The only re-adjustment needed, is a recourse to the methods by which the apostles and the preachers of the early Church, the monastic preachers, the reformers, and the ministers of the great Wesleyan revival, swayed the minds of those who heard them. One need only read the polemical wrangles and endless subtleties with which the great confessional controversies of the 17th century filled the pulpits of Germany, to understand how Christianity lost its hold on the popular mind, and fell an easy prey to rationalism. When men are reasoned with on religion, they will always doubt; but when the gospel lives and burns before their sight, they believe. After Bellamy,

Hopkins and Emmons had bred a generation of preachers who constructed and proved, dissected and reconstructed theology, answered objections, and analyzed all possible conditions of the soul in its relations to its Maker, Sabbath after Sabbath in the pulpit, and called this preaching the gospel, the next most natural step was the entrance of Unitarianism into the New England churches. And that heresy will go out, finally, as it has begun already to show signs of doing, by reversing the methods that brought it in: by preaching that burns its way to the popular heart in virtue of its intense faith and fervid love. Dr. Bellows foreshadowed the end of his elegant heresy when he complained that the orthodox churches declined to argue the theological question, and went on their way preaching and praying, and exhorting men to repentance and faith in Jesus Christ as their Saviour, as if there were no Unitarian churches. No skepticism can resist the logic of this moral contagion.

But is anything permanently effected by mere enthusiasm? Is it enough to produce a lasting change in a man's thoughts and purposes that he be made sympathetically to feel very deeply? If all that the preaching of the gospel did, was to make men feel, it certainly would leave them as it found them. The storm swoops down upon the ocean and rolls its billows in vast commotion; but when the sky clears and the swell goes down, the sea is just as it was before, its currents, its tides, and life unchanged. There is another element needed, the element of truth. When the heart is melted it will take any impression readily; but that which makes the impress must itself be sharp, clear, penetrating, decided. Always the earnestness and impetuosity of the great preachers has had an edge of the very keenest. They did not fight as one that beateth the air, nor tell a tale

"full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing."

They had a system of facts and doctrines to establish in the minds of their hearers. And they did infix them, so deeply that after every great onward wave of Christianity, after ev-

ery great revival, certain bold, fundamental headlands of truth were left clear and sharp above the flood of feeling. Christianity is a system of truth, and it fixes itself deep in the persuaded intellect, as well as in the believing heart. But the method of the propagation of this system of truth is peculiar. This leads to a second statement.

II. CHRISTIANITY HAS BEEN PROPAGATED BY THE DECLARATION OF THE TRUTH IN THE WAY OF WITNESSING, RATHER THAN BY REASONING AND CONVINCING MEN THROUGH ARGUMENT.

Argument has its place in the Christian system. It fortifies the believer; it silences the gainsayer; it expands and gives coherence to the apprehension of God's moral government. But it is not the method by which the religion of Christ is to be successfully propagated. The doctrines of the Christian faith admit of proof; they call for searching examination; but they are themselves weapons of attack. They have but to be stated to command attention: they carry weight by their mere annunciation. The doctrine of the redemption of man by the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, for instance, has a solid basis of argument: it is buttressed by the whole structure of Biblical history; it has a rational foundation; it stands for a complete section of scientific theology; but the simple rehearsal of the story of the cross, its intent, and the offer it makes to men, has been proved a thousand times to carry with it a weight of conviction, a lodgment of truth, that no explanation or argumentation of it could ever effect.

As a divinely constructed religion, Christianity has a twofold aspect: one for attack, and the other for defence. Its doctrines are capable of proof drawn from many sources. They are capable of logical and philosophical organization into a connected, mutually supporting system. It is able to give to the intellect a good reason for being. But for attack and conquest, it needs only to be stated.

In the first place, it is a history. It bases itself on facts and persons. Its doctrine is very largely its history. It is not only its doctrine that God was manifest in the flesh, suffered

for the redemption of man, rose from the grave, ascended into heaven, sends the Spirit to convert men, forgives sins—it is, also, a part of its history. This puts into the hands of the preacher of Christianity an incalculable advantage: it gives him the vantage over all other moral teachers, that the historian and painter have over the philosopher. He has not to reason of abstractions and address himself to the speculative intellect: he has a story to tell, persons to introduce, deeds to bear witness of. Christ and his apostles availed themselves of this vast vantage-ground. They knew, probably, better than any succeeding age before this has ever known, the power there lay in the simple story of the cross and of the resurrection. It was the telling of that story, which spread the faith of Jesus till it conquered the Roman empire. The power of that simple witnessing has been attested through so many generations, and under so varied circumstances of climate, race, government, civilization, that it is idle, here, to dwell upon it. The missionaries in every new field are bearing witness to-day that the same method of simply rehearsing the story of the cross and of the resurrection, is still the effective method of propagating Christianity. Whenever there comes a man into our churches, who goes back to the old facts and persons, and is able for a little while to penetrate the callousness of oft repetition, and restore the gospel story to something of its freshness, we experience ourselves the wonderful power there is in the history of the acts of redemption.

In the second place, the peculiar, characteristic doctrines of Christianity, are such as take hold, as if by fore-ordained fitness, upon the mind and heart of man. It is by a foreordained fitness that they produce conviction. They are the truths that God has seen good to address to man to win him, and they fit into the wants of human nature as the key into the lock. Let a preacher proclaim the Christian doctrine of the sinfulness of man, and his responsibility to God as his Maker and Judge, and, despite the natural aversion of the heart to so humbling and startling a teaching, there is something in every man that echoes back an 'Amen.' But if the preacher

goes on to reason upon it and prove it, every fresh evidence destroys something of the force of the conviction. When the doctrine of the expiation of sin by the suffering of Christ upon the cross is enunciated, not as a theological dogma to be accounted for and proved, but as a fact given of God, it goes with the power of irresistible persuasion to the popular heart. So palpable is this that such men as Bushnell, who deny the doctrine, feel under a compulsion to use the atonement hymns that are full of the blood of a crucified Saviour. A skeptical writer reluctantly admitted, in a recent criticism of Dr. Bushnell's work on the atonement, that, whilst the philosophic theory of a substitutionary sacrifice was to his mind mere sophistry, it was possible by a statement of the doctrine, after the Biblical form and manner, to make a presentation that no logic of infidelity could resist. The power of the cross of Christ to convince and persuade men, is not in its philosophy, but in its simple statement. The same is true of all the peculiar Christian doctrines: the Resurrection of the body, the Judgment of the righteous and the sinner, the worlds of retribution and reward. Simply to propound these great doctrines as they are set forth in the Scriptures, is to awake a response in the soul of the hearer. They were made for man; or, rather, man was made for them, and they strike on the heart as voices from a half familiar world. The troubled, reluctant soul shrinks away; but deep within it says, 'This is the truth.'

In the third place, Christianity in its appeal to man, speaks with the voice of authority. Its open, frank avowal is, that it has a message to man direct from his Maker. It brings with it its credentials: "Thus saith the Lord." It confirms every hard saying by the assertion, 'it is true because God says so.' Notwithstanding all the cavils of godlessness and skepticism as old as Lucian and Celsus, as old as Christianity itself, at the claims to a divine origin and inspired revelation that Christianity puts forth, men have listened to Christ and bowed to his rule, because they believed him, in some way, authorized to speak for God. Men naturally look for a revelation. The lofty Plato and the genial Socrates are at one

with the wild nomad of the desert here. The human heart through the roar and clash of the most godless time, pauses, at intervals, to listen, half doubting, half hoping, for some voice from heaven.

Now, this expectation may be reasonable or unreasonable: with that question we have nothing, at present, to do. All we are concerned to know is, that such a posture of anticipation is native to the universal human heart. Christianity assumes that it will find that expectation: its tone is that of a master coming to the household where his presence and command are looked for and will be unchallenged. It finds the door half open: it has only to speak authoritatively and the heart at once takes the place of obedience, and says, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." To begin by offering to prove its divine origin, and thus raising the question, may be very logical, but it is not the method of conquest. This would be to throw away half the advantage Christ took when he declared to the wondering Jews, "*I say unto you.*" Why should the preacher of Christianity surrender, on the eve of battle, the impregnable position its Founder assumed when "he taught as one that had authority?"

Mr. Beecher speaks with more than his usual wisdom on this point, and, as any habitual reader of his sermons will see, in point-blank contradiction to a good deal of his practice. "Do not *prove* things too much. * * You can drive back from the heart the great surges of faith with that kind of specious argument, and even the true witness of the Spirit of God in us may be killed in your congregation by such doubting logic. * * In so far as truth itself is concerned, preach it to the consciousness of men. * * The word of God and the laws of truth are all conformable to reason and to the course of things that now are; and, certainly, everything that is required in a Christian life—repentance for sin, and turning from it, the taking hold of a higher manhood, the nobility and disinterestedness of man—go with God's word and laws naturally. * * Take things for granted, and men will not think to dispute them, but will admit them, and go on with you and become better men than if they had

been treated to a logical process of argument, which aroused in them an argumentative spirit of doubt and opposition."

There is no better commentary on these principles than Mr. Beecher's practice. There is a certain stage in many of his sermons when the people look dubious: some get fidgety; others drowsy; a look of doubt and opposition shows itself on many faces—that is when the great preacher is doing what he so strenuously, in theory, reprobates—*proving* things. But, presently, he lays down his logical hammer and trowel: he is done building buttresses to his doctrine for to-day. He rolls back the curtain from the truth he would enforce: in a scene, a figure, an apt fitting of it to the common experience of an every-day life, a sharp, pungent statement, or, a tender play of feeling about the thought, the truth stands out in lines of light and fire. It is not proved, it is only declared: it glows with an inner light: it seizes on the imagination, the sympathy, the humor, the hope, the fear, the secret longings of the hearer: it rushes in upon the soul as a triumphant army rushes into a fortress, over the parapet, through the embrasures, by the ditch, the gate, the postern.

One often thinks that Mr. Beecher preaches a part of every sermon with an eye to the requirements of philosophy and the cool judgment of the speculative critic of the pulpit. Certainly, the aggressive conquering part is not the proving, argumentative part. If ever one feels an irresistible impulse to contradict and fall foul of the great preacher, it is when we are being argued with and taken through the arches and piers of his discourse. But is not that feeling of opposition always aroused when the intellect is addressed through the use of argument? Yes, it is: and it is just because it is so, that the power of the Christian preacher lies in his ability to keep himself and his hearer off the battle-ground of argumentation. To argue with one, is to open the lists and invite him to a combat. So soon as you say, This or that is so, and I will show it to be so by such and such proofs and reasons, you invite criticism. It introduces, of necessity, into an atmosphere unfavorable to persuasion. Whoever reasons and

proves must go into that atmosphere and make the best of its disadvantages. But the peculiar vantage-ground of Christianity is, that for conquest it does not need to meet men on that field. It has only to declare itself to win men. Its *Thus saith the Lord* has struck on the moral consciousness of men as light on the eye, as the voices of birds on the ear. Its very utterance has been argument and conviction, and men have been persuaded, and bowed down their wills and hearts to its yoke, as they have believed that the sun shone, or that spring had come, because they saw it, felt it.

Such has been the method of the great persuaders of the pulpit. The apostolic men have left us the fragments of a few of their sermons: Peter on the day of Pentecost and before Cornelius; Stephen before the Sanhedrim; Paul at Athens. What course do they adopt? They state a number of facts familiar to their hearers, and then pass on to the declaration of other facts and doctrines that are new. They bear witness to them; they do not prove them. They appeal to the moral consciousness, to the religious sense of their hearers.

The preaching that overran the Roman empire, so far as we can catch any trace of it, was of the same sort. The homilies of the bishops, the addresses of the evangelists, were all of the character of witnessing.

The preaching of the Middle Ages, in so far as it was effective at all, was still but the statement in more vivid form, intensified by the power of imagination and pathos, of the great cardinal facts of Christianity. The preacher was only a lens through which the rays fell in a concentrated beam upon the audience: that which kindled and fused was the truth, only gathered into unity, condensed, and directed to one end.

There was a mighty stir and resurrection of life, when the preachers of the Reformation went up into their pulpits and began to speak. But they only caught the great doctrine of Justification by Faith on the mirror of their own personal experience and flashed it back upon the multitude. They did not preach to the people, as many think, in the argumen-

tative, metaphysical style of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, nor in the manner of their dogmatical and polemical treatises. They described the power of sin as they felt it. Luther said continually in his preaching, "I": "I, who lived the life of a spotless monk, yet felt within me the troubled conscience of a sinner. * * Then I said to myself: Am I, then, the only one who ought to be sad in my spirit?" "These words *justus* and *justitia Dei* were a thunder to my conscience. I shuddered to hear them; I told myself, if God is just, He will punish me." To this the conscience of the people answered. They saw themselves in that mirror. But they were not reasoned with. Only the truth was declared, and they said "It is true." Then the doctrine of a free pardon, through the blood of Christ, was declared, its seal in the work of the cross, its efficacy. "Then," says Luther, "I felt myself born anew, and it seemed that I was entering the open gates of heaven." Every guilty soul felt the fitness of that blood to cleanse.

All over Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, Scotland, England, the great wave swept; but it was always by the same means: the witnessing of the great evangelical doctrines accepted as the truth because they carried conviction by their very utterance.

When the morning of the Wesleyan revival broke, what do we find the preachers of that movement doing? Wesley, Whitefield, Fletcher, the whole army, take up the Bible, read the story of the cross, and apply it at once to the people before them. They had no new doctrine; they had no new proofs of it; they did not attempt argument. They merely declared it. Isaac Taylor, in his work on Wesley and Methodism, dwells on this phase of the movement: "Whether Wesley and Whitefield, and others of their class, addressed Christianized congregations, or the lowest of the people, a wonderful uniformity marked the effect produced, where any effect at all was produced. But this could not have been if the preacher had gone about to produce conviction by a circuit of reasoning; for in that case what might have swayed one mind, would not have touched the other. What the

preacher advanced ordinarily, was a bare affirmation of that which the human mind, by its very structure, assents to as true, when it is so affirmed as to take hold of the conscience." What is this method but that of simple witnessing? Thus the movement began.

But as it was followed up through those wonderful years, when the leaven went through the mass of the lower English classes and penetrated the populations of America, what was the method? Still the same. Mr. Taylor gives another picture of the settled practice of the leading Methodistic preachers: "With some of them, the primary or rudimentary announcement—which is that of the preacher of repentance—namely, a free and full pardon of sins—was the customary theme in the pulpit; and the preacher's characteristic motto-text, was of this sort—'In whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins.' Another taking up this primary truth, combined it with bright and enlivening announcements of the unrestricted *intention*, or universal availability, to all mankind of this salvation. 'Christ'—this is the preacher's text—'is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world:' or this—'The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.' Another, whose eye is fixed upon the grace and majesty of Him who is 'the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person,' enlarges with pathos and copiousness of illustration upon those inexhaustible themes for which the Scriptures afford materials, and which relate to the personal perfections of Him who, as truly man, and truly God, gathers to himself whatever can move the profound and reverential affections of men."

Two men of our day have been eminently successful as preachers of the gospel: Mr. Spurgeon and Mr. Beecher. They are very diverse in their mental structure and habits: the one is of the narrowest of the narrow of the old Calvinistic school, the other, broad, even to laxness; but the power of these men is identical. They bear witness to certain great cardinal features of Christianity. In the final effect of their preaching the philosophy of Mr. Beecher, of which he is

somewhat too lavish, drops out as so much dross out of the smelting of the ore, and the Calvinism of Mr. Spurgeon blows away as so much chaff when the grain is threshed out. Who remembers their philosophy or their Calvinism, after hearing or reading their sermons? But the great truths that touch and move and convert and build up their vast congregations are the same in each pulpit. They dwell much on cardinal facts of Christianity: the love of God, the sinfulness of man, the worth of the soul, the life and death of Christ for the redemption of man, the work of the Holy Ghost, the glory of Heaven, and, in Mr. Spurgeon's case, the terrors of Hell. These they are continually affirming and reaffirming with infinite variety of utterance, but with the greatest simplicity and directness of impression upon the consciences of their hearers. Mr. Spurgeon has more direct power than Mr. Beecher in bringing men to a personal acceptance of Christ: it is because he has, though a Calvinist, less of philosophy and a great deal more direct affirmation of religious truth. They are princes in the pulpit because they affirm and enforce and apply truth rather than prove it and defend it.

When one of the great revival waves, that have at intervals swept over the land, begins its course, what sort of preaching do we find addressed to the great concourses of people that gather? The argumentative, philosophical, defensive, critical sermons, are shoved into the drawer: the great verities of Sin, Atonement, Repentance, Regeneration, the Cross, the Judgment, Heaven and Hell, are set forth in the simplest, directest manner.

Times change and men with them; but the change is only superficial. Under all the mutations of fashions, dialects, political and social revolutions, the great strata of human feeling, conscience, spiritual and moral need, run unchanged and unchangeable. What touched the Jew and the Greek and the Roman when the first preachers of Christianity went abroad from Jerusalem, will touch men in America now. And if anything is written clearly in every page of the history of the progress Christianity has made, it is this: Do not go to men with proofs of Christianity, but with the naked

truths themselves; do not preach about the doctrines of Christ, but preach Christ himself.

What every preacher needs to say to himself a thousand times over is this: Let me beware of proofs: they are like a bad gun that damages more in the recoil than by the shot. Let me remember to state and restate and gather the rays of truth by incarnation and imagination, by repetition and application, into a focus till the blaze kindles. I have a natural ally in every man's breast: let me be careful to sound the note he will recognize and answer to, and not challenge him by the defiance of a logical blast to come out and give me battle.

Now if all this be so: if there is, in the fervors of faith and deep personal persuasion, a spiritual contagion that makes men sensitive to the truth, and, in the facts and doctrines of Christianity, an authority that enforces conviction by their very statement—then there are several lessons for us who have something to do in directing the action of the Church.

1. The first duty of the preacher, whose vocation is to win men to Christ, is to shun the atmosphere of doubt for himself as a region of malaria. The professor, the author, the apologist for Christianity, whose business it is to examine the foundations of faith and defend them, may give himself to the scrutiny of the questions that lie at the base of all religion, and specially that concern the fundamentals of Christianity: he may put himself into the judge's place and give an impartial hearing to all witnesses and the counsel for both sides. But this is not possible to one who would go to men as a preacher of aggressive faith. He who is habitually hearing and answering the doubts and objections to Christianity put forth by its assailants, insensibly loses the fervor of his faith: he may still believe, but not with the intensity of conviction and realization of the unseen which, as we have seen, is the first qualification of the successful preacher. Something of the atmosphere he has been breathing will go with him into the pulpit and muffle his voice and steal away the glow of his belief. The air of doubt is like that of the lofty

mountain peaks, clear, sharp, apparently invigorating, it steals away the fire of life. The voice that rings in the valleys dies away in a feeble cry on the heights. There is no resonance in the thin ether of speculation. The preacher must shun it, or pay the price of an enfeeble, because hesitating, utterance.

He will find the habit of weighing the evidence, stopping to hear what may be said on the other side, stealing upon him the very presentation of the truth. Instead of affirming and then enforcing, making his appeal directly to the moral and spiritual consciousness in the men before him, he will be affirming and then answering the imaginary objector, who, in any ordinary audience, is purely imaginary. He will be getting out his scales and weighing evidence, raising points of difficulty and insensibly addressing himself to the intellectual, critical side of his hearers' minds. Such a preacher sends away his hearers only half persuaded, and with minds in the condition of a jury after the judge's charge, instead of being, as they should be, as the jury after the advocate's appeal.

Is the preacher persuaded himself that Christianity is true, and that the gospel is God's veritable message of life or death? Then he has nothing to do with the objections to it and the difficulties that beset it intellectually. His business is to persuade men of it, not by lies nor any unfair representation, nor, on the other hand, by arguments and proofs and rebutting evidence; but by the positive presentation and urgency of its solemn truths. But if he would do this with a single mind, let him refuse to keep company all the week with objectors and unbelievers. He may shake them off when he goes into the pulpit on Sunday, but the echo of their words will linger in his ear, the subtle influence of their doubts will palsy his tongue. He will convince nobody because he is only half convinced himself.

2. There is room enough along the vast line of the Church's attack on the kingdom of Satan for unlearned men. If men appear in our churches, or are picked up in the sweep of the great revivals that break into the lowlands of the masses, who have a fire of conviction compelling them to testify of

the grace of God, and who are capable of a simple, downright statement of the Christian verities, the Church has no call, though they may be of narrow range of knowledge and untrained reasoning powers, to put them aside, or insist on their taking a full course of education. Such men often have a wondrous power of piercing the indifference and defiance of the unbelieving masses: witness Richard Weaver, the butcher preacher of England, and that whole class of unlettered men who appear at the great races and fairs of England to preach, who tramp the lanes of the country, and thread the alleys of the cities, and are continually winning multitudes to the truth. Perhaps every one who has much to do with the active ministry has come in contact with some such mind. "Educate them," say the sticklers for regular routine, "and then let them preach." No; many a man who has had force of conviction, and a native power of simple declaration of the truth, has been forever marred by an attempt to superinduce a higher culture.

Unquestionably, the highest power is that of faith and spiritual fervor fusing large knowledge and thorough culture. The great leaders and builders in the advance of Christianity have been such. But there is a class of minds that are only crippled by an attempt to equip them with much culture: they are Davids encumbered with Saul's armor: leave them to their sling and pebbles from the brook. Our seminaries in New England, especially, have been sending out a class of young men of piety and devotion, but in whom piety has been like a little fire under a great heap of fuel, quenched and reduced only to smouldering and smoke. So alarming did this tendency become that, a few years ago, the accomplished Professor of Sacred Rhetoric at Andover, Dr. Phelps, felt constrained to address an earnest warning to his students to beware that their culture did not kill their ability to reach the popular heart.

3. We may see, now, in what, humanly speaking, lies the reserve force of aggressive Christianity. It is in the latent power lodged in the contagion of a fervid faith, and in the authoritative appeal the primary facts and doctrines of Chris-

tianity make naturally to the human heart. In virtue of these two primal forces, Christianity has always proved equal to any emergency. If its theology and philosophy are outgrown, if its external machinery of propagation breaks down under the stress of some new and vaster form of civilization, its real strength is left untouched. Let the spirit of life kindle in one soul,—and that kindling, like the advent of a poet, or great thinker, or supreme military genius, is something that cannot be counted on,—and it spreads through a community as leaven pervades the whole mass. The dogmatic system may lose edge and weight; but the facts of Christ's life and death, the doctrine of his person and Spirit, and the relations he brings men into to another world, when urged with the simplicity of authority, may at any time touch the old springs of human nature that never fail.

These element of power are simply incalculable, because they have to do with what is most fundamental, yet most imponderable, in man: the sympathetic, religious nature. Again and again have the philosophers ruled it out as non-existent, because not measurable and calculable; and again and again, after being ruled out, it has unmistakably asserted itself. It may lie inert through a slumbering generation, as in England before the Wesleyan revival; it may be overlaid and buried, as in continental Europe before the Reformation; it may be despised and counted out of the real factors of civilization, as it is by the science of this generation: but when the time of need comes, one ardent soul speaks, the old story is rehearsed, and the sleeping awake, the buried comes out of its grave, the wisdom of philosophy is confounded by a resurrection that refuses to be measured or contained.

When or how such an awakening may come no science can predict. The forces that effect it are internal, volcanic. Vesuvius, after a revolutionary outbreak, lies idly curling its wreath of thin smoke for centuries. Vineyards are planted on its slope, villages nestle at its base, generation succeeds generation in quiet, till men think its fires are gone out. It belongs to a former age. But it only sleeps.

We need not be afraid for the faith once delivered to the saints. Sometimes, as we look abroad on a world and a Church that have almost lost the tradition of the aggressive power of Christianity, we are half persuaded, as the enemies of Christianity are fully persuaded, that the fires of the once mighty religion are dying out. The world wanders among the vast formations the power of a living faith once threw up, digs out the wonders of former times, carves the cold lava into graceful shapes of poetry and æsthetic religion, and philosophizes over what it pleases itself to call a *dead faith*. But at any time the fervid faith of a few ardent souls, who centre their all in Christ, and the reaffirmation in their naked simplicity of the old story of the cross and the resurrection, may put forth a power before which indifference and skepticism and defiance of spiritual truth will be swept away in an irresistible flood of conviction.

ARTICLE VI.

THE ELOQUENCE OF ST. PAUL.

By REV. JOEL SWARTZ, D. D., Williamsport, Pa.

It is more than questionable whether, if the apostle Paul had been tried by the technical rules of the rhetoricians of his day, he would have been pronounced an eloquent man. Though able to speak the Hebrew, the Greek and the Latin, the three languages of antiquity in which nearly all that was worth knowing in his day was written or spoken, and though called upon, by his itinerant ministry, to address audiences gathered from all ranks of society, and of the most diverse religious views and grades of intellectual culture, it is remarkable that, beyond a few suggestive facts and allusions, we know little or nothing of the apostle's peculiar style of speaking. This is all the more noteworthy when we remember that he frequently had among his auditors, if they did

not compose the entire assembly, the fastidious and polished Greeks, who gloried in nothing more than in their incomparably excellent and mellifluous language, and in the art of speaking it with the greatest purity and fluency. How much they gloried in "the enticing words of man's wisdom" and the "excellency of speech," is more than once alluded to by the apostle Paul. Yet even these fastidious Greeks, among whom Paul had many disciples, have not left us any critical estimate of the oratorical ability of the great apostle. They tell us much about the ten Attic orators, approved by the school of Alexandria; about the masterly eloquence of Demosthenes and his rival Æschines; the almost supernatural sweetness and beauty of the oratory of Isocrates, but of a later orator who addressed them more frequently and more effectively than any one of their illustrious speakers, we have little beyond a few rather depreciative and characteristic criticisms. This very silence, however, may afford us a hint of something peculiar and masterly in the oratory of St. Paul. The Greek orators sought to please. They addressed the eye, the ear, the critical judgment and exacting taste of their auditors. With "enticing words," with the "excellency of speech or of wisdom," they sought to carry away captive the precise but superficial judgments of a people who spent their time either in hearing or telling some new or smooth or beautiful thing. The people demanded something that would amuse or please or entertain, and the orators sought to meet the demand.

Paul came among these gay and ambitious triflers with a most sober purpose, and upon a mission of the most momentous importance. Passing by alike their rhetoric and their philosophy, their "excellency of speech" and their "wisdom," as equally vain; he determined to know nothing among them save Jesus Christ and him crucified." When he essayed to address these polite critics upon a theme which appeared to their "wisdom" to be "foolishness," he did not adopt the prevailing oratory any more than the prevailing philosophy, for both seemed to adhere together, but used a method becoming the simple grandeur of his subject, so that their faith might

not stand in "the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." With a soul thoroughly penetrated by the great truths he came to deliver, he spake to them not only upon a new theme, but with an unwonted power. Passing by all such mere trifles as studied verbiage and elocutionary artifices, he at once sought to convince the judgment with unanswerable truth and to pierce the conscience with the sword of the Spirit; to "open the eyes" of men, "to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive the forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith"—the faith that had delivered his own soul. Instead of addressing the eye and tickling the ear and amusing the fancy, in his own language, he sought, "by manifestation of the truth, to commend himself to every man's *conscience* in the sight of God." Now the conscience does not criticise; when a man can get hold of that, he at once disarms all criticism and puts his hearer in an attitude the most widely different from that of the cold critic. None of those three thousand who were "pricked in their heart" by the flaming sword of the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, were capable of remembering a single gesture or intonation of the principal preacher on that occasion. You might as well expect a man, wounded in a hand to hand fight in the day of battle, to be able to sit down and criticise the manner in which the enemy drew and brandished and plunged the sword into his body, dwelling chiefly upon the grace or awkwardness of the movement, as to expect a man wounded in conscience to describe the inflections and gestures and attitudes of the speaker whilst that searching work was going on. Who can believe for a moment that Felix, pale and trembling, as if in the presence of the supreme Judge, knew anything about the rhetoric of the master who had conjured up before his affrighted imagination and guilty conscience the retributions of the last day? It would be scarcely more absurd to suppose that he would be capable of criticising the pronunciation, emphasis and gesture of the Judge himself in the act of cursing and exiling him into outer darkness forever, than to suppose that in the awful moment of his alarm he could

have criticised the elocution of the apostle. About all we know of the great missionary's preaching, is the *effect* which he everywhere produced. He disarmed the critics by attacking them at a point where all criticism refuses to judge. Himself forgetful of all studied artificialities of speech, he spoke in a manner the least adapted to awaken the critical propensity in his hearers. He rose above the arts and technicalities of the schools, and moved in a region so elevated that men thought as little of pointing their impotent shafts of criticism at him as the huntsman thinks of drawing his bow upon an eagle in the clouds.

We are reminded, however, that some did dare to criticise the apostle. The Epicurean and Stoic philosophers at Athens thought him a *babbler*, and some Corinthians said of him, "His letters are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak and his *speech contemptible*." As to the first class of critics, it may be said their judgment related to the matter rather than the manner of the apostle's preaching. It was the foolishness of the gospel, rather than that of the preacher, that offended them. Not perhaps being orators themselves, but "philosophers" rather, they would naturally look more into the substance of the message than at its rhetorical dress. It was the strange doctrine of "Jesus and the resurrection" that seemed to them an unintelligible babble. The discourteous appellation, *Σπερμολογος*, "babbler," literally, a "seed-gather," spoken of birds that pick up the seed when it is sown, is sometimes applied to a man who speaks, as one sows seeds, without order or connection. Now it was the want of a discernible logic, and not a defective rhetoric, that called forth the depreciative philosophic judgment on this occasion. When, however, it is said of the apostle's *speech* that it was "*contemptible*," it will be urged that here is an adverse criticism upon the rhetoric of the speaker. It is possible that this may have been the intended force of the hostile judgment. The contrast drawn between the speaking and the writing of the apostle, rather favors this interpretation. It is not unlikely that the apostle, being "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," educated in Jerusalem, did not speak the

Greek with entire accuracy, fluency and purity. There may have been an inelegant brogue upon his tongue, and this would no doubt be sufficient to condemn him in Corinth as a "contemptible" orator. His deficiency in this respect, may have been, at least in part, the reason for his reference to his "speech" in his letter to this people. But his reference is made in the style of an apology, which, whilst it serves to relieve him, comes very near turning back upon his critics the charge that, in his judgment, *their* "speech" is contemptible. Besides, we must remember that this judgment of Paul is pronounced by *enemies*, and hence does not prove him a bad speaker any more than some other charges from the same class prove him a bad man.

From the criticism last noticed, and a passage from his letter to the Galatians, and a few others of kindred type, a great mass of tradition and conjecture has been manufactured, tending to depreciate both the person and the oratory of St. Paul. That the apostle confesses some physical infirmity which was obvious to the eyes of men, and which subjected him to severe trial, seems to be evident from the following: "Ye know how through *infirmity of the flesh* I preached the gospel unto you at the first, and of my *temptation which is in the flesh*, ye despised not, nor rejected, but received me even as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ." This, together with the enigmatical "thorn in the flesh," which has been such a thorn to curious commentators, is the small stock in trade with which a class of ingenious and mostly minute critics have carried on such a various business in the way of manufacturing likenesses of St. Paul. It is fair to say that not one of those who has drawn his conception of Paul from the allusions made to his "infirmities," without the corrections and qualifications necessarily implied in his laborious and long life, has given us anything more than a contemptible caricature. If we accept the figure made of St. Paul by early tradition and ingenious speculation, it will be next to impossible, with such a weak bodily presence, to make a speaker who will not be "contemptible."

For if, as Blair says, "a not ungainly presence and a full

and tunable voice are important qualifications" to the public speaker, then, tradition being true, Paul had not at least the first of these qualifications. Chrysostom says that "his stature was low, his body crooked, his head bald, and he was only three cubits high," but adds, with great beauty and force of expression, that "he was tall enough to touch the heavens." Jerome says, "his constitution was infirm, and he was much afflicted with headache." This is outdone by an equally authentic expression of Lucian, who, in his *Philopatris*, calls him, "the high-nosed, bald-pated Galilean," and adds, "*Corpore erat parvo contracto, incurvo, tricubitali.*" Tradition describes him as a man of low stature and inclining to stoop, of a grave countenance and a fair complexion. His eyes were possessed of a certain suavity of expression, his nose was gracefully aquiline, his forehead nearly bald, his beard thick and, as he advanced in years, like the hair of his head, somewhat silvered by age." We cannot imagine such a dwarfish, ungainly, distorted physique as this, "a chosen vessel," adapted to endure the herculean labors which he performed, and "bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel." A man who could endure to old age, then die a death of violence, the "journeying often," the perils of robbers by his own countrymen, the heathen, in the city, in the wilderness, in the sea, among false brethren; his weariness, painfulness, watchings often, hunger, thirst, fasting, cold, nakedness, the daily care of all the churches, besides the persecutions, labors more abundant, stripes above measure, his imprisonments, deaths oft, his one hundred and ninety-five stripes from the Jews, together with his, "Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep," was hardier than Hannibal, tougher than Cæsar, had more endurance than Buonaparte, and was braver than all of them put together. To say of such a man that his "bodily presence is *weak*," is in contradiction not only of all the analogies of fact and experience, but of physiological law.

If the critic spoke a probable untruth when he said "his bodily presence is *weak*," it is probable he was equally un-

truthful when he said his "speech is contemptible." If his labors and sufferings imply a strong body, the effects of his speaking, and the products of his pen, imply a strong mind and vigorous elocution. There are recorded of him no such feats of physical manliness as of intellectual prowess and achievement. If we are not to make him a prodigious anomaly, reversing all the ordinary facts of experience, then we ought to conceive of Paul as a man of extraordinary compactness and proportion of physical structure, "a chosen vessel" indeed, just such a man as God would likely make to do the most heroic and responsible labor ever allotted to a human being. Allowing much for the representations of modesty and true humility in his account of "the infirmities which were in his flesh," we may consistently say he was a physical as he was an intellectual giant. But be this as it may. We have something more significant than the silence of habitual critics, and the impotent carplings of personal enemies. Suppose his bodily presence *was* weak, we know, of a truth, his speech was not contemptible. On the contrary, we know it was admirable. It is a model for all who, like him, are preaching "Jesus and the resurrection," and are beseeching men, as though God did beseech them by their ministry, to become reconciled unto God.

There are several indispensable and pre-eminent qualifications which an effective speaker must have, and Paul had these in an extraordinary degree.

1. The first is a clear apprehension of the subject about which one is to speak. "*Clearness*, force, earnestness," said an eminent American orator, "these are the qualities which produce conviction." That Paul had a clear vision of his subject, need not be argued. A man of his acuteness of intellect, enlightened and inspired by the Holy Spirit, could not apprehend the truth doubtfully. Jesus and his gospel were revealed not only *to* him, but *in* him, and he could not but speak that which he knew, and testify that he had seen. It is true, there are some things in his writing which, as Peter said, are "hard to be understood," but this arises from the obscurity and grandeur of the subject, the na-

ture of our faculties, and not from any obscurity in the style of the apostle. Human speech was often burdened, and sometimes plainly incompetent to set forth many of the mysteries of the gospel, and if it seemed to stoop and to labor and, like a giant under a great load, to lose its ease and grace of movement, it was due to the weakness of the medium and the burden of the subject, and not to any want of skill or clearness in the mind of him who employed it as the vehicle of his ideas. Paul was capable of digressions, parentheses and abruptness in style, but not of weakness, obscurity or inaccuracy. Indeed he seems to have combined in himself all the excellencies of the other sacred writers. "He had the loftiness of Isaiah, the devotion of David, the pathos of Jeremiah, the vehemence of Ezekiel, the didactic gravity of Moses, the elevated morality and practical good sense of James, the sublime conceptions and deep views of John, the noble energy and burning zeal of Peter. To all these he added his own strong argumentative powers and intensity of thought."

2. He had also "force, earnestness." These were pre-eminent among other good qualities. Reversing the order of these words, and putting them in the relation of cause and effect, we would say that the apostle had great force because he had great earnestness. As heat gives expansive force to water in the form of steam, so does earnestness in the soul give energy to every one of its faculties. The apostle was the subject of an earnestness that not only aroused all the faculties of his being, but set them into such energy of motion as seemed almost to kindle them into a flame by their own rapidity of movement. "From the moment of his conversion, on the way to Damascus, he had but one object of existence, and that was the glory of God in the salvation of souls, and but one way of seeking it, and that was by preaching the cross. Wherever he went, whatever he did, to whomsoever he spoke, he was watching for souls. Whether reasoning with the Jews in their synagogues, or discoursing with the philosophers on Mars Hill, or preaching to the voluptuous inhabi-

tants of Corinth, or appealing to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, or pleading in chains the cause of Christianity at the tribunal of Festus in the presence of Agrippa, or writing letters from prison to the churches he had planted, we find him everywhere, and always, the earnest minister of Jesus Christ.*

This clearness of vision, and this feeling of earnestness, gave Paul's addresses three qualities essential to all effective speaking, *pertinence, practicalness and persuasiveness.*

1. The preaching of Paul was *pertinent*. He always spoke to the point. He shunned not to declare unto his hearers "the whole counsel of God," and "kept back nothing that was profitable." Hence his discourses were as various in matter as the variety of subjects he discussed. Then, too, his audiences were widely diverse from each other. He addressed all classes, among both Jews and Gentiles. He plead the cause of Christ before kings and governors, and discoursed before the ignorant multitude. He preached the Christ of Moses and the prophets before the Sanhedrim of his own people, and the doctrine of "Jesus and the resurrection" before the scoffing philosophers of Athens, and was not ashamed to preach the same gospel at Rome also. But aiming ever more at one thing, he did not fail to adapt his discourses to the condition, education, habits of thought, and even the prejudices of men. "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." To the Jews he became a Jew, that he might save the Jews. Consequently he professed, and that sincerely, a profound respect for the laws and institutions of Moses. Were his hearers "of the seed of Abraham," so was he, and he addressed them as his kinsmen, "fathers and brethren." He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law, a Pharisee; brought up at the feet of Gamaliel and taught "according to the perfect manner of the law." He reasoned with them out of their own scriptures, and "taught none other things than Moses and the prophets did say should come." He is compelled to appeal to Caesar

*An Earnest Ministry, by John A. James.

but not that he has "ought to accuse his nation of." Every where it was for "the hope of Israel that he is bound with this chain." Thus to the Jews he became a Jew.

But he was "the apostle of the Gentiles." In preaching to them, his grand theme and purpose are the same, but his style and manner are very different. He does not reason with the heathen out of the Jewish scriptures. He opens before them the larger and older volume of nature, having the same origin and teaching, so far as it goes, the same lessons with Moses and the prophets. With the Lycaonians who would sacrifice to him and Barnabars as to Jupiter and Mercurius, Paul reasoned about "the living God which made heaven and earth, and all things that are therein," and spoke of "the rain from heaven and fruitful seasons," and thus dissuaded these ignorant barbarians from idolatrous sacrifice to "serve the living God." At Athens he takes for his text, not a selection from Moses or the prophets, but an inscription upon one of their altars, and reveals to them the character and claims of that very Deity whom they unconsciously and ignorantly worshipped, citing as testimony against their superstition the sentiments of their own poets.

If he reasons with Felix, or Festus, or Agrippa, standing in the courts of the great, and addressing the learned, his whole demeanor is courtly and his speech is elevated and refined. If he addresses the ignorant multitude in some remote village, his manner is plain and his speech is simple. With the faithful and teachable, he is gentle, "even as a nurse cherisheth her children." But with the "puffed up" and refractory, he uses "sharpness" and even speaks of the "rod" as a possible necessity. If any wandered out of the way, being ignorantly misled by false teachers, he deals gently, in "meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," rebuking with all "long-suffering and doctrine." But he could also deliver the headstrong and unruly to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that they might learn not to blaspheme. Paul, in his dealings with all classes of men, manifests a happy union of two almost incompatible characters, a universal and flexible adaptation with an intense personal consistency and integrity

of character. "This one thing I do," is made to harmonize with, "I am made all things to all men," and both are made necessary by his all-commanding purpose, that "by all means he might save some."

2. Paul's preaching was *practical*. James is often called the practical and Paul the doctrinal writer. The discrimination is just, but if by this be meant that the doctrines of Paul are not practical, then it is not. It is true that Paul is the most doctrinal of all the apostles, but it is equally true, and that, too, on this very account, that he is the most eminently practical. His work was largely initial. He laid the foundation and others built thereon. He planted, others cultivated and reaped what he sowed. It was his ambition to preach the gospel where Christ was not named, and not merely to build on the work of others. This necessitated indoctrination. He was compelled to deal in first principles, and hence we have much didactic and polemic theology in his epistles. This fact, too, is unfavorable to the exhibition of the higher degrees of impassioned utterance. He could not charm the Jews into an acceptance of the crucified Nazarene as the Messiah, by mere bursts of eloquence. He must reason and demonstrate — "opening and alleging" from Moses and the prophets, the misunderstood proofs of Christ's divine mission, offices and work. Nor could he conquer the prejudices of the ignorant heathen, or overcome the speculations of their philosophers by mere denunciation or confident assertion. His duty to the one class required him to use great plainness of speech, to the other great acumen and depth of argument. In neither case was he permitted to indulge in mere flights of fancy or bursts of declamation. Hence we find the apostle engaged largely in reasoning, teaching, proving, all of which necessitated deliberate, didactic plainness of speech. But in all this elaboration of argument and doctrinal exposition, the apostle kept in view the practical uses of this teaching. He never indulged in speculations for the purpose of showing his ingenuity, or in argument for the purpose of defeating an opponent, or in science or philosophy for the purpose of captivating his hearers or gratifying his own ambition. On

the contrary, he subordinated everything to practical results. He discusses the doctrine of depravity, but only that he may show how God hath concluded all, both Jews and Gentiles, under sin, that he may have mercy upon all. Thus he would overthrow the righteousness which is of the law, exclude boasting, and use the law as a school-master to bring men to Christ. He reasons grandly about the mysterious doctrines of divine sovereignty, election, foreordination, but not ambitiously and speculatively, but for the purpose of showing the relations of Jews and Gentiles to the Church of God, the "good olive tree," and thus their relations to each other. He would uphold the Jew who seemed like a branch broken off from his own tree, and caution the Gentile, who had been grafted into his place, against pride and contempt of his unfortunate brother, and lead all, with himself, to exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God, how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out."

He elaborates the doctrine of the resurrection, answers curious questions about "How are the dead raised and with what bodies do they come," but only as a means of reaching and enforcing his conclusion. "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

Among the heathen he alludes to the arms of the soldiers, the races and boxing and wrestling of the athletæ, but the conclusion is one of the most earnest practical exhortations to be found in all his epistles: "Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all to stand. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace: above all, taking the shield of faith wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

3. The apostle's preaching was *persuasive*. The object of

his whole ministry, as he beautifully and emphatically informs us, was to "*persuade* men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God." Concluding his long and masterly argument stretching over the first eleven chapters of Romans, he says, "*I beseech* you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God," &c. Not only when speaking of the "mercies of God" did the apostle use persuasion, but also in connection with such views of the character and dealings of God as would rather terrify than persuade. Where the mere declaimer grows harsh and denunciatory, Paul melts into pity and entreaty. "Knowing the terrors of the Lord," said he, "*we persuade* men." Paul evidently had a tenderness of heart and manner that gave all his preaching the predominating quality of persuasiveness. It modulated his voice, softened his features, suffused his eyes, and gave his whole manner the expression of one who loved men with an intensity of sanctified devotion. A man who could truly say, "Remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one of you, night and day, with tears;" and, in dealing with such characters as some of those were whom he found in the Corinthian church, "I wrote unto you with many tears"—and, to the Philippians, "I have told you often, and now tell you, even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ"—must have had a heart as tender, and a manner of dealing with men as full of sympathy, as a loving mother shows in her management of her children. If now, with this sympathy you will unite the sturdy manliness of one of the bravest of heroes, you will have a character uniting strength with tenderness to a degree that will give him an almost sovereign control over the hearts of men. These are the very qualities which give a speaker what we call magnetic power. With this power Paul could blanch the cheek of an audacious Roman procurator, and win kisses and parting tears from friends rendered almost insoluble by his departure. Dionysius, contrasting the effects produced by the speeches of the two most illustrious orators Greece ever produced, said, "When Demosthenes spoke he inspired the hearer with all the passions incident to humanity, and filled the breast with an agitation as fierce as that

which raged among the initiated during the celebration of the mystic rites of Cybele. But when Isocrates spoke, he left the hearer in a contemplative mood, as if he had been listening to the strains of the finest music." Paul united the power of the former to agitate, as is proved by the case of Felix and others, with that of the latter to soothe and inspire, as is evident from many cases, both in the Acts and his Epistles, where he appears like one standing with beautiful feet upon the mountains bringing glad tidings and publishing peace.

One thing is certain, he always moved his audiences, and sometimes most powerfully. It was impossible for men to go away from his speaking in an indifferent manner. If they did not agree with him, and submit to the gospel and become disciples, they were put upon some effort of defence, explanation or opposition. On a day appointed at Rome, many Jews came to his lodging "to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law and out of the prophets, from morning until evening." It is no slight compliment to a preacher to be able to keep an audience interested as long as that. "And some believed the things which were spoken and some believed not." When this wonderful day's work was done, the people did not retire satisfied, but "had great reasoning among themselves." Even at Athens there were "certain who clave unto him and believed," and "others said, We will hear thee again of this matter." After his sermon in the synagogue at Antioch, in Pisidia, the people were so moved that on ^athe next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." The Lycaonians thought that Paul was one of their superior deities, "because he was the chief speaker." Listening to him, the Jews became so excited that "they cried out and cast off their clothes and threw dust into the air." Felix trembled before him, Agrippa was almost persuaded to become a Christian, Festus thought much learning had made him mad. A man so capable of arousing and exciting men of all classes, and filling society with commotion wherever he went, even to such an extent as

to give color to the exaggeration that he was turning "the world upside down," was a man of no contemptible powers of speaking. There have been many eloquent preachers since his day, but the world has not yet seen his equal. The very planet feels his tread, the air yet vibrates with his speech, and his influence is felt throughout the world. There are a few reflections which may appropriately follow this concise view of the eloquence of St. Paul.

1. *From Paul one may learn what and how to preach.* He made his hearers think more of the message and of its claims upon them, than of the messenger.

When Louis the XIV. heard Massilon, he said, "When I hear other preachers I usually go home *praising them*, but when I hear you, I go away *condemning myself*." Paul's preaching was a perpetual confirmation of his noble assertion: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus sake." Like a planet near the sun, St. Paul stood so near the cross that he was lost in the brightness of its glory. He never thought, for the purpose of revealing himself, of making a transit of his little opake self across the disc of its glory. He was content to be near and lost in its brightness. We see the *man* in his largest figure only when we stand with our backs to the cross, as we see the full moon when we stand with our backs to the sun. The place of Paul as a preacher is revealed by the very obscurity that rests upon him. To have had a critical and commendatory estimate of his oratory, would have located him in the opposite point of the heavens from where we find him. "Nor of men sought we glory, nor of you, nor of others—God is witness."

One of the saddest spectacles which Heaven beholds on earth, is that of a preacher before an audience of immortal beings, ambitious of their applause, attempting by attitude, gesture, tone, trope, and figure, to excite admiration of himself and

Play his brilliant parts before their eyes
When they are starving for the bread of life !

Scarcely less sad is that of an audience of candidates for eter-

nity sitting for an hour to speculate on the preacher, to watch his motions, to be delighted with the melody of his voice, the smoothness and grandeur of his periods, the sprightly images of his fancy, and go away remembering only what they should never have noticed, and praising only what they should have condemned.

Let such preachers and audiences bethink themselves, and see if they be not described in the language of the prophet: "They come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before me as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them; for with their mouth they show much love, but their heart goeth after covetousness. And lo! thou art to them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument, for they hear thy words but they do them not."

2. From Paul we learn the end of preaching. It is to persuade men to be reconciled to God. To do this, preaching must be pertinent, practical and persuasive. No man ought to preach on such subjects as are not cognate and closely connected with the cross of Christ. No doubt a relation may be shown between Jesus Christ and him crucified, and all questions of science, philosophy, history and government; for the cross of Christ is the sun and moral centre of the universe, and everything, in some sort of an orbit, revolves around it. But the orbits, in many cases, are so remote and withal so ill defined, and the inter-spaces so dark and cold, that we are lost in trying to thread "the illimitable way." It is well to stay near home and leave speculation to the philosophers and professors of theology. It is the preacher's business to preach a gospel that will save, and in a manner adapted to his hearers. Some he must save "with fear pulling them out of the fire," of others he must "have compassion, making a difference." Thus his preaching will be *pertinent*.

He must be *practical*. He ought to preach not only to demonstrate a truth, to defend an article of the creed or to silence an objector, but to enforce duty, inspire devotion and make men obedient to God as dear children. Paul never pushed

his speculations beyond the limits of practice, and did not lose the Christian in the Philosopher.

A minister must *persuade*. Even when preaching the terrors of the law, he ought to persuade men. Paul preached but little about hell. The word itself does not occur in any of his discourses or epistles. There was fire in his preaching, but it was that which melted rather than consumed. The harsh and unfeeling way in which the doctrine concerning hell has often been preached, has done much to make men despise or disbelieve the gospel. "I tell you even *weeping*," said the apostle, "that they are enemies of the cross."

3. If such ought the minister to be, what ought to be the hearers? Shall he be *pertinent*, and they become offended when they feel the application of the gospel, and become his enemies because he has told them the truth? When he urges the claims of duty and would make them practical Christians, shall they turn his discourses into a subject of vain curiosity or idle speculation? Shall a minister spend and be spent for his hearers; shall he count no labor, or study, or suffering, too great to be endured for them, so that, being exceedingly desirous of them, he is willing to "impart to them, not the gospel of God only, but his own life also, because they are dear unto him," and they have no concern for themselves, no care for their minister, and no solicitude for the salvation of those who have not the gospel? "Let him that readeth understand."

ARTICLE VII.

RECENT WORKS ON ENGLISH LITERATURE.

By Prof. E. FERRIER, of Pennsylvania College.

A Complete Manual of English Literature, by Thomas B. Shaw, with notes and illustrations by William Smith, LL. D., and *A Sketch of American Literature*, by Henry T. Tuckerman. New York: Sheldon & Co.

History of English Literature, by H. A. Taine,—translated by H. Van Laun. New York: Holt & Williams.

A Manual of English Literature, by John S. Hart, LL. D., Professor in the College of New Jersey. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother.

Three Centuries of English Literature, by Charles Duke Yonge, Regius Professor of Modern History in Queen's College, Belfast. New York: Appleton & Company.

De Quincy, in his essay on Pope, makes a distinction of great value between the literature of *knowledge*, and the literature of *power*. "The function of the first is to teach; the function of the second is to move." The first is transient, provisional, and may be superseded. The second is finished forever. The moral essays of Francis Bacon are unalterable, and are to-day, in school and college, communicating an educating power, that can scarcely be estimated. His scientific works are quite forgotten in the rapid advance of modern science. The speculations of Hobbes and Harrington, are superseded in the study of governmental theories, but the *Iliad* and *Æneid* will never be lost. The accumulated knowledge of centuries will not hide or overshadow such classics as Dryden's Ode on St. Cecilia's Day, Collin's Ode on the Passions, or Wordsworth on Immortality, neither will any research of science add to their completeness.

That the literature of *power* should have a large and prom-

inent place in a course of liberal study, is a favorable sign for the future, specially when greater prominence is given to the literature of our own language. The tendency of our age and country is to narrowness and exclusiveness. In the intensity of our business life, every man marks a foot-path, and walks in it with the precision and persistency of a treadmill operation. The trades and professions are cut up in small pieces, and each one takes his part, and loses his interest in every thing which concerns the connected whole. Our industry has become very fragmentary. It is even written on our circulars of education: "Every boy should study *only* what he most needs to know when he becomes a man." True, there is a lesson of exceeding value in the text, "This one thing I do." Concentration of effort is necessary. Superfluous work must be cut off, if we would be crowned with success. Let the small twigs and shoots that take up the life and bear no fruit, be taken away, and the current of vigor thrown in a few healthy stalks. Yet, men should not live in ruts, either in education or in work. Let everything be practical, if we will have it so, but be sure that you put the best and largest meaning in that word. There is nothing more practical than that which puts a man in full possession of all his trained powers. How we have narrowed and abused the word. Any thing by which we can make money, be it running a steam engine, or building a house, or surveying a route for a road, alone is practical, not that which helps us use all we are, and all we may become, for the good of man and the glory of God. We hail, then, as a good sign these numerous works on English Literature. Contact with the best models of culture and art will enlarge our vision and widen our affinities, and thus the violence of our ruling passion will be toned down. A better balance will be preserved. The broader view will make us throw away our hobbies, and cure us of our conceits and exaggerations. If we can get in the society of Bacon and Milton and Coleridge, and hear them talking on themes which pertain to all time, we will be ashamed of our pets. There is no surer mode of reducing

the inflammation occasioned by absorbing devotion to a favorite pursuit, than by getting in the company of the great and good.

As frequent inquiries are made as to the best method of studying our literature, it can not be amiss to present in brief compass the leading features of several works on the subject, now prominent before the public. In the year 1846, Thomas B. Shaw of the University of St. Petersburg, Russia, issued a work called "*Outlines of English Literature.*" In 1864, Dr. William Smith, a name most favorably known in almost every department of study, revised the work of Dr. Shaw, and gave it to the public under the title: "A Complete Manual of English Literature." Of all the works yet published, it is, in our judgment and experience, incomparably the best fitted for school and college use. The name of Dr. Smith is a guarantee of its merit. Dr. Addison Alexander of Princeton, said to his students, "never hesitate to read or buy a book which has Dr. Smith's name on it." This work on Literature is critical and discriminating. The chapters on The New Philosophy of Elizabeth and James First, and on John Milton, in brilliancy and keen criticism, can scarcely be surpassed in the whole range of Review literature. The principle which underlies the general plan is, that the civil, political and religious character of the times give color and shape to the writings of the period. The productions of the age of the Commonwealth are marked by the characteristics of the times, and are quite unlike those of the age of Elizabeth, or of the Restoration. The lines between these several periods are drawn with satisfactory clearness and exactness. The style of the book is clear and vigorous. In the notes and illustrations appended to each period, the Editor has introduced almost every name and book of any significance in the language. In this mode, while the general plan of the work is not burdened by a great multiplicity of obscure names and useless dates, a copious and well-arranged index directs us to brief statements on books of not sufficient importance to have a place in the text proper. Thus the two desirable feature of accuracy and comprehensiveness are happily blended.

It may be an objection that all living writers are excluded from the plan of the work. The first chapter, on the Origin of the English Language, is scarcely worthy a place in the volume, while the appendix on American Literature, by Henry T. Tuckerman, is far below the usual performances of that accomplished scholar.

A still more recent work in this department of study, is that of Dr. Hart, Professor in Princeton College. Dr. Hart has achieved a national reputation as a successful educator, and his book has the high recommendation of having sprung from actual work in the class-room. The plan is unique, and in many respects highly advantageous for gaining a general view of our literature, and retaining the leading names and dates. Some single name is selected as representative of the period, and then by skillful grouping, subordinate names are gathered around it. Chaucer, Spenser, Shakspeare, Bacon, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Cowper, Wordsworth and Tennyson are taken as the best and truest expressions of the age in which they lived, or of the kind of writing which is made the theme of the chapter. The amount of material crowded in the volume is amazing—material, too, which is made available by a judicious index. As a work of reference, this exhaustive character is a good feature. As a book for the class-room, the burden is too heavy. Too much has been crowded in the volume. No persistency, or skill in teaching could carry a class of students through such a mass of details. A single chapter contains no less than ninety-four writers in prose, poetry and fiction. The time has come when we must have the hardihood to be ignorant of much that is really good in our language. An exhaustive study of the subject is neither possible nor profitable. All history must be eclectic. Completeness of detail on the events of a single day is quite beyond our reach. He is the truly philosophic historian who selects wisely, as well as arranges on a scientific method. As far back as the age of Elizabeth, the number in England engaged in writing and publishing poetry, could be reckoned by hundreds, if not thousands. What shall we say of the increased fertility of the nineteenth century? Then

this greatly enlarged number is to be multiplied by the almost countless prose writers, historians and novelists. It must be evident at a glance, that any attempt to compact all these names and dates, with any satisfactory critical remarks, in reasonable compass, would be an arduous undertaking. The critical remarks on the authors are original, or from some recognized authority on the subject. They are uniformly good and discriminating. The mistake is made of putting these valuable criticisms in finer print, and thus producing the impression that they are of subordinate value. A factitious estimate is put by very many on mere dates. It is well to fix in the memory a few leading ones, but to burden the memory with them is useless. There is neither culture or discipline in such work. The chapters on the several versions of the English Bible, the English Prayer Book, and on the Hymnology of our language, are of singular interest, and contain material which heretofore has been quite inaccessible to the ordinary student. Dr. Hart does full justice to the great theological writers of the 17th century, as well as to the Wesleys, Whitefield, Toplady, and kindred spirits of a later date. He is scanty in his praise of the literary character of the poets of the Revolutionary school, belonging to the 19th century. Of Byron he says: "No one of his poems, taken as a whole, can be accepted as a finished and satisfactory work of art—he was a selfish libertine, both in his life and opinions, and he deserves the neglect towards which he is slowly but surely gravitating."

In a work of such completeness of presentation and marvelous minuteness of detail, it is no wonder that there should be some mistakes as to names and dates. The greater wonder is, that the number is not much larger. Some of these have been pointed out, and are such as may easily be corrected in a future edition. An appreciative review in the *Aldine* notices the following: "He is mistaken in saying that George Gascoigne's comedy of "Supposes," was altered from the Spanish; it was a translation from Ariosto, and is remarkable as being the first drama, whether original or translated, in English in prose. He is mistaken also, in saying of Henry

Chettle, a dramatist, contemporary with Shakspeare, that he is chiefly known for his attempt to disparage the latter. The facts are these: Chettle edited Greene's "Groat's Worth of Wit," and in his capacity of editor, published a letter which was written by Greene on his death-bed, and addressed to his quondam acquaintances Marlowe, Lodge and Peele. In this letter, Shakspeare is alluded to as "the only *Shakscene* in the country," and a line in his Henry VIII. is parodied. He was offended, and Chettle apologized handsomely in his preface to "Kind Hart's Dreame," a work of his own composition." A mistake is also made in the statement that Suckling, decidedly the best type of the Cavalier poet of the 17th century, died in Paris in want and obscurity. There are two accounts of the death of Suckling; one to the effect, that it was caused by the treachery of a servant, who ran away with his money, and to delay the pursuit which he expected would be made, drove a sharp nail through the sole of one of Suckling's boots, which ran into his foot, as he pulled on the boot in haste. The other account hints darkly, as a tradition in the Suckling family, that the luckless poet committed suicide. Vanessa, the love of Swift was Esther Vanhomrigh, not Miss Julia Vanhomrigh. Yet these, and some few other matters which might be pointed out, are things of minor importance as contrasted with the great merit of the work. No one can hesitate in assigning the book a first place in its class, and all workers in the same field will welcome it as a valuable help. The Professor has promised a volume on American literature, wrought out on the same plan, which will supply a long-felt want.

The most recent work in this department to which our attention has been turned, is that entitled *Three Centuries of English Literature*. The author is Prof. C. D. Yonge. For several reasons we awaited the appearance of this book with more than ordinary interest. The author occupies a prominent position. He is Regius Professor of Modern History and English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast, and the impression that educators in English and Irish institutions are much more thorough is so common, that we looked for

something far above the usual range. Also, the author made a most favorable impression on the educated mind of this country by the publication of an English-Greek Lexicon, edited in this country by Dr. Drisler of Columbia College. But his work on English Literature has excited a general feeling of disappointment. It is very faulty in plan, or rather, no plan can be detected in the presentation of his subject. He thinks English Literature properly begins with Shakspeare. The study of Chaucer, in his judgment, belongs to the antiquarian and not to the modern scholar. Quite different is the estimate of Coleridge, who in his old age, expresses his increasing appreciation of Chaucer; or of Craik who places Chaucer, as to merit, in the same relation to the English language, that Homer sustains to the Greek and Dante to the Italian. The Faery Queen of Spenser is also passed by, because of the "desultory intricacy" of the allegory. It assuredly must have required an unusual degree of courage thus to slight him who has been honored for generations with the epithet, "Father of English Poetry"—of whom Drayton wrote:

"That noble Chaucer,
Who first enriched our English with his rhymes,
And was the first of ours that ever broke
Into the Muse's treasures, and first spoke
In mighty numbers;"

or to pass by that other one, who has so uniformly been the model and delight of genius, that he is known as "the poet's poet." If Prof. Yonge is so repelled by Chaucerisms and old forms of language, an examination of even Shakspeare's dramas as they appear in the First Folio Edition would have constrained the author to put the beginning of our literature at a still later date. The following from *The Merchant of Venice* contains some forms which are strange to us, and which need some explanation:

"How sweet the moone-light sleepes vpon this banke;
Iere will we sit, and let the sounds of musicke
Creepe in our eares soft stilnes, and the night
Become the tutches of sweet harmonie."

We are somewhat surprised at the style of Prof. Yonge. The sentences are involved and obscure. They have no organic unity. He tacks clause to clause, until you can scarcely conjecture where and when the end will be. Long and irrelevant parentheses are thrown in. You can not open anywhere without meeting with cases of awkward involutions, squinting construction, and splitting of particles. Yet all this might be tolerated, if redeemed by any special freshness, or originality in research and criticism. Even in this feature, everything is unusually tame and common-place, and nothing is said which has not been told a hundred times before, and perhaps a hundred times better. Thus, wanting in plan, very faulty in style, and utterly destitute of any vigor of thought, or interest in critical remark, it can not be unjust to say in regard to this volume, that it has not a redeeming feature, and it is difficult to account for its republication in this country by one of our leading houses.

Of the books mentioned at the head of this article, that of H. A. Taine has elicited the most cordial approval, and awakened the most general interest. It differs from the others, in not being designed or fitted for the class-room. It presents more at large the philosophy of literature, and throws in a subordinate place the barren dates of history. It uncovers with great skill the hidden influences which made the ages and the men. It is of interest to know who Milton and Bacon were, but far more important to have the veil drawn aside that we may see the formative agencies that helped in the growth of genius. We would rather look in on Milton at his study table, and see how he wrote and worked, his moral and intellectual habits, and what books were his favorites, than to have treasured in our memories all the facts of his outer life. Biography is not worth much more than the idlest gossip of the hour, if it does not show us more or less of the inner man. Taine is unmistakably infected with the poison of the French Positive Philosophy, which leads him to a moderate estimate of the heroes of the age of the Commonwealth, and to somewhat extravagant statements concerning those of a later date. He never loses an opportunity of

glorifying science and reason, even at the expense of revelation, and frequently his depreciation of some Christian doctrines sinks almost to a sneer. In the chapter on Stuart Mill, he thus speaks of the imagined barrier which the doctrine of a special Providence throws in the way of progress in original investigation in England:

"You have learned men, but you have no thinkers. Your God impedes you. He is the Supreme Cause, and you dare not reason on causes, out of respect for him. He is the most important personage in England, and I see clearly that He merits His position; for He forms part of your constitution, He is the guardian of your morality, He judges in final appeal on all questions whatever, He replaces with advantage the prefects and gendarmes with whom the nations on the continent are still encumbered. Yet this high rank has the inconvenience of all official positions; it produces a cant, prejudices, intolerance and courtiers. Here, close by us, is poor Max Müller, who, in order to acclimatize the study of the Sanscrit, was compelled to discover in the Vedas the worship of a moral God, that is to say, the religion of Paley and Addison. Every year, when we read the Queen's speech in your papers, we find the the compulsory mention of Divine Providence, which comes in mechanically, like the apostrophe to the immortal gods on the fourth page of rhetorical declamation. All these cavilings and pedantry indicate to my mind a celestial monarchy; I mean that it relies more willingly on tradition and custom than on examination and reason."

His estimate of Stuart Mill is extravagant, and the position which he assigns him in philosophy, exalted:

"Who is he! A political writer. His little book on liberty is as admirable as Rousseau's *Contrat Social* is bad. Is he Hegelian? By no means. He is too fond of facts and proofs. Does he follow Port Royal? Still less; he is too well acquainted with modern sciences. Does he imitate Condillac? Certainly not; Condillac has only taught him to write well. Who, then, are his friends? Locke and Comte in the first rank; then Hume and Newton. Has he reached a grand conception of the universe? Yes. Has he an individual and complete idea of nature and the mind? Yes. Has he combined the operations and discoveries of the intellect under a single principle which puts them all in a new light? Yes."

After Taine had published in pamphlet form this fifth chapter, he received from Stuart Mill a note, stating that it would be impossible to give in a few pages a more exact and complete notion of the contents of his work, considered as a body of philosophical teaching.

Taine's inability to distinguish accurately, or adequately to appreciate the influence of Christianity has led him to speak in very damaging terms of *Paradise Lost*. His remarks on the great epic are severe enough to be amusing:

"Adam and Eve the first pair! I approach. I listen, and I hear an English household, two reasoners of the period. Col. Hutchinson and his wife. Heavens! dress them at once. Folks so cultivated should have invented before all a pair of trowsers and modesty. This Adam entered Paradise via England. There he learned respectability, and there he studied moral speechifying. We recognize the Protestant husband, his wife's confessor. Next day comes an angel on a visit. Eve makes sweet wine, perry creams; scatters flowers and leaves under the table. Good housewife! How many votes will she gain among the country squires, when Adam stands for Parliament? Adam belongs to the opposition, is a Whig, a Puritan. The serpent seduces Eve by a collection of arguments worthy of the punctilious Chillingworth. The flow of dissertations never pauses; from Paradise it gets into heaven; neither heaven nor earth, nor hell itself could swamp it."

Yet, in some respects, he says grand things about Milton:

"Vast knowledge, close logic, and grand passion; these were his marks. He conceived the loftiest of ideal beauties, but he conceived only one. The broad river of lyric poetry streams from him, impetuous, with even flow, splendid as a cloth of gold. * * He hated heartily. He fought with his pen, as the Ironsides with the sword, foot to foot, with a concentrated rancor and a fierce obstinacy."

Quoting one of Milton's prayers, Taine says:

"This song of supplications and cheerfulness is an outflowing of splendor; and if you search all literature, you will hardly find poets equal to this writer of prose."

He gives the Bedford tinker the following compliment: "Bunyan has the freedom, the tone, the ease and the clearness of Homer; he is as close to Homer as an Anabaptist tinker could be to a heroic singer, a creator of gods." He has comparatively little to say of the theologians. He cuts off Wesley and Whitefield with the remark: "A sort of theological smoke covers and hides this glowing hearth which burns in silence." He speaks of Coleridge as "a thinker and dreamer, poet and critic, who hit the supernatural and the fantastic." Southey "spanned the universe and all history with his poetic shows." Wordsworth "was a poet of the twilight. His

paintings are cameos with a grey ground, which have a meaning; designedly he suppresses all which might please the senses, in order to speak solely to the heart." After speaking of Byron as one, "so unbridled, that after spending his life in braving the world, and his poetry in depicting revolt, he can only find the fulfilment of his talent and the satisfaction of his heart in a poem [Don Juan] in arms against all human conventions," he yet acknowledges, "Byron has so much wit, so fresh a wit, so sudden, so biting, such a prodigality of knowledge, ideas, images, picked up from the four corners of the horizon, in heaps and masses, that we are captivated, transported beyond limits; we cannot dream of resisting." But every one will have an interest in hearing what this Frenchman thinks of Shakspeare:

"Shakspeare imagines with copiousness and excess; he spreads metaphors profusely over all he writes; every instant abstract ideas are changed into images; it is a series of paintings which is unfolded in his mind. He does not seek them, they come of themselves; they crowd within him, covering his arguments; they dim with their brightness the pure light of logic. Never, I think, in any nation of Europe, or in any age of history, has so deep a passion been seen. Like a too fiery and powerful horse, he bounds, but cannot run. He bridges at a couple of words an enormous interval; is at the two poles at a single instant. Shakspeare flies, we creep. These vehement expressions, so unexpected, instead of following one after the other, slowly and with effort, are hurled out by hundreds, with an impetus, ease and abundance, like the bubbling waves from a welling spring, which are heaped together, rise one above another, and find no place wide enough to spread and fall. You may find in *Romeo and Juliet* a score of examples of this inexhaustible inspiration. Their language is like the trill of nightingales. Shakspeare's wits, Mercutio, Beatrice, Rosalind, his clowns, buffoons, sparkle with far-fetched jokes which rattle out like musketry fire. Lear's curses, or Queen Margaret's, would suffice for all the madmen in an asylum, or all the oppressed of the earth. The sonnets are a delirium of ideas and images, turned out with an energy enough to make a man giddy."

It might be interesting to give Taine's estimate of some of the most recent writers, as Thackeray, Dickens and Tennyson; but the quotations already made are enough to exhibit his spirit and style. Notwithstanding the objections which have been made, and even others which might be started re-

specting his views of particular writers and times, we yet think that these volumes are among the most readable that have been recently issued. Taine seems to speak with the disinterestedness of a foreigner. For a Frenchman, he has wonderful catholicity of taste. He is almost always thoughtful, fresh, spirited, racy and keen in observation. It is a little singular, yet true, that the best history of English literature should be the work of a foreigner, and the truest interpreter of English thought and life, a Frenchman.

Compilations of our literature, of the kind to which we have adverted, have their use. They should have a place in an educational course. Historical in their character, they take us round the outer walls and bid us count the towers and mark well the bulwarks. But we need something more. We must not simply read about these productions of genius, we must study the works themselves. The educational influence will be slight to stand in the distance, even though it be in rapt admiration. Close and reverent study of these best models in our tongue will impart a culture akin to the character of those who wrote them. Hearty appreciation of Spenser or Milton from personal study, will alone develop the highest and best results. Such admiration is fruitful. On those lines of close contact will be transported lineaments of truth and beauty which will be unconsciously taken up in our own moral and mental constitution. These books are receptacles of spiritual power, and if we can in any way put ourselves in communication with them, they will give something of their own worth. Channing said, "Books give to all who faithfully use them the spiritual presence of the best and greatest of our race. No matter how poor I am. No matter though the prosperous of my own times will not enter my obscure dwelling. If the sacred writers will enter and take up their abode under my roof, if Milton will cross my threshold to sing to me of Paradise, and Shakspeare to open to me the words of imagination and the working of the human heart, and Franklin to enrich me with his practical wisdom, I shall not pine for want of intellectual companionship,

and I may become a cultivated man, though excluded from what is called the best society." This depth of impression on our minds can be made only by a study like that, with which for centuries the Greek and Latin have been pursued. Peculiar idioms are to be examined, forms of speech explored, allusions investigated, poetical and rhetorical forms analyzed, words traced to their origin, and comparisons made with other languages. It is hard to check the rising impatience so as to secure this method of study, and even to the educated, it may seem bookish and fragmentary. The all-important principle, that we must get at the literature through the language, has been settled for centuries in reference to all tongues but our own, and one of the problems to be solved in this age of improved educational advantages is, how to fix and reduce the study of the English to a form fitted for the class-room — how to make available for purposes of mental discipline and culture, that large store of Philological materials which have been gathered by earnest workers in this and other lands, in the investigation of a language, which Jacob Grimm, a passionate lover of his native German, says, "has produced and upborne the greatest and most predominant poet of modern times, and with which in wealth, good sense, and closeness of structure, no other of the languages at this day spoken, deserves to be compared, not even our German, which is torn, even as we are torn, and must first shake off many defects, before it can enter boldly into competition with the English."

ARTICLE VIII.

EXPOSITION OF 1 COR. XV. 22.

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Few texts of scripture are more familiar to the readers of the Bible than this. It is one of those utterances which fix themselves in the mind never to be forgotten. In fewest words and sharpest contrast, it presents truths wide-reaching as the human race, and stretching forward through eternity. In briefest compass there are compressed a depth and breadth of meaning that volumes could not fully unfold.

It is the lot, however, of this familiar and fundamental passage to be quite differently understood, and to be used in support of very different views of doctrine. This arises, it must be confessed, from the language admitting of different interpretations, and from a certain degree of mysteriousness attending the subjects of death and the resurrection. There are mysteries about our being, our relations, and our destiny, which revelation does not profess entirely to remove or explain. Could the exact meaning of this text be positively settled, it would be a gain to the cause of Christian truth, and a relief to many minds. If we cannot hope to do this, we may still do something towards arriving at an intelligent and satisfactory conclusion as to the mind of the apostle when he penned these words.

We have one advantage, not always possessed, in examining texts of scripture of doubtful or difficult interpretation—the reading is not disputed. The original text presents no *variae lectiones* to annoy us, or to divide our attention. The task is simply to ascertain the fair and true meaning of the words and the truth they are designed to convey. Whilst every word is significant, the interpretation hinges upon the words "*all*"—"die"—"*made alive*."

The *γὰρ*, for, indicates that what is about to be said is to

explain and corroborate the truth the apostle is discussing—the resurrection of the dead. The *ὡςπερ γὰρ*, “for as,” followed by *οὕτω καὶ*, “even so,” is the regular form of comparison, in which the one is intended to illustrate the other—“for as in Adam, * * even so in Christ.” “*In Adam*” is a stronger form of expression than through or by Adam. In Romans 5 : 12, we read, “as by, *διὰ*, one man sin entered into the world, and death by, *διὰ*, sin.” Here it is not *by* or *through*, but *in*, *ἐν*, Adam, and in, *ἐν*, Christ. In the present passage the whole race is exhibited as in some way included “*in Adam*.” His fall was the fall of mankind. His sin plunged the race in ruin. In him all became subject to death. The apostle uses the present tense “die,” or are dying. The picture is that of the whole human family, standing in Adam, diseased in its root or source, and dying in him.

On the other hand, “*even so* in Christ shall all be made alive.” Here the future is employed to point forward to something yet to take place, when the grave shall give up its dead. The same form of expression is made use of, as “*in Adam*,” “*even so in Christ*.” As the whole human family sustained a relation to the first Adam, so they all sustain a relation to the second Adam. In the one they all die, in the other they shall all be made alive. Death in Adam, life in Christ, are the contrasted elements in this striking comparison.

The chief differences in the interpretation of the passage may be presented under the three leading views that follow :

1. That the apostle's design is to express universality, so far as the human race is concerned, in both clauses—the universality of death, and the universality of the resurrection. According to this view, the death spoken of is the death of the body, and the resurrection is the resurrection of the body. “*In Adam* all die”—the reign of death is universal, bringing all to dust—“*in Christ* all will be made alive”—raised again from the dust of the earth to live forevermore. This view has received the suffrage of most interpreters, ancient and modern.

2. That his design is to express the universality of death and the resurrection, so far only as the parties are severally represented in Adam and in Christ. The word "all," in the latter clause, is, according to this view, to be restricted to believers, or to those who are in Christ. 'All who are in Adam die, all who are in Christ shall be made alive.' The death and life spoken of are not simply of the body, but refer to the whole man, and the resurrection is that of the just to life and blessedness. This view has been advocated by some distinguished commentators, including Dr. Hodge, who says, "the word *all* in the latter part of this verse is to be restricted to all believers." But, however ably supported, this interpretation has failed to receive general approval.

3. That the design is to express universality in both cases, not simply in regard to the death of the body and its resurrection, but as including a resurrection to life and blessedness of all who die in Adam, or of the whole human family. Thus interpreted, the passage is made to teach the doctrine of universal salvation.

Taking up these views, of the last it may be said that it is not in harmony with the general drift of the discussion, and is opposed to numerous plain and undoubted declarations elsewhere in the Bible. The apostle is not discussing the subject of spiritual death and life, but that of the resurrection—the resurrection of Christ, and in Him the resurrection of the dead. This is so plain that it needs no detailed examination to show it. To apply his declarations, therefore, about a literal resurrection of the body, to the resurrection to a new and spiritual life, is not only without any foundation to rest upon, but is to oppose the plain and decisive teaching of the same inspired apostle in other places. We learn from the Bible that there will be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust, a resurrection of life and a resurrection of damnation. This interpretation then may be rejected, without further consideration, as opposed to the meaning of the apostle here, and contrary to the analogy of faith.

The second view, that the *all* in the latter clause is to be limited to believers, has more to commend it, but will be

found, it is believed without sufficient arguments in its favor to claim our acceptance. The chief arguments advanced in its support are the following.

1. That the apostle is treating only of the resurrection of Christ and believers, and would not naturally or likely include in this passage those who are out of Christ. But even admitting that the language in general in this chapter applies only to Christ and believers, it would not follow that this verse may not have a wider sweep, and include all mankind. It is introduced to illustrate and confirm his argument, and as a general statement would be strictly in point. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The death by man is universal, the resurrection by man is the same. Then the corroborative explanation: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

2. That the relation expressed implies a limitation to believers. It is alleged that we die in Adam because of our union with him as our head and representative, and that the relation expressed by "*in Christ*" can only apply to those who are united with Him, or are in Him by faith. But Christ took into union with Himself our common human nature, and His resurrection secures the resurrection of the race. Natural death, the death of the body, is consequent upon our relations to the first Adam, our resurrection is consequent upon our relations to the second Adam. In neither case is any voluntary act on our part required. Moral and spiritual death implies our voluntary assent to sin, as our spiritual life depends on our voluntary acceptance of Christ as our Redeemer. As to the death and resurrection of the body, the law is universal in the one case as in the other. Adam's sin is the death of the whole family of mankind: Christ's resurrection is the resurrection of all.

3. That the word ζῶσιν, rendered "shall be made alive," is never used of the wicked, but is employed in reference to the work of Christ only when it is intended to signify that life of blessedness of which he is the source. This argument

is more than doubtful. It restricts the meaning of the word without any sufficient reason. It is quite certain that the word is used where there is no reference to anything spiritual, or to that higher life which Christ communicates to His own. In this very discussion the apostle uses it in speaking of the process which takes place in the natural world, where the seed sown germinates and grows. Verse 36, He says, "Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened (*ζωοποιεῖται*) except it die." In the Septuagint the word occurs where the meaning is plainly nothing more than giving life, or quickening that which was dead, 2 Kings 5 : 7 ; Neh. 9 : 4. From a comparison of passages in the Septuagint and the New Testament it may be safely affirmed that the word is employed to express a quickening into life, whether of body or soul, and is not necessarily limited to the work of Christ in true believers.

Rejecting the views criticised, as not resting on any satisfactory or reliable basis, and being liable to insuperable objections, we are left to inquire into the claims of the remaining view first presented, viz., that the apostle's design was to express the universality of death and also of the resurrection; and this without any distinct reference to moral or spiritual character, but simply because of the relations sustained by a divine constitution. The simple fact that we seem to be shut up to this view, or to acknowledge that no satisfactory explanation can be given, might be urged in its favor; but we prefer not to rest the interpretation on so indefinite and negative a basis as this. In the way of direct argument, the following may be offered.

1. It preserves to all the words their simple and natural meaning. "*All*" is taken in the same sense in both clauses, and without any limitation in either. It is allowed to mean just what it should mean and nothing else. To understand it in the different clauses of the same sentence as having entirely different significations, must shake our confidence in the meaning of words, and their fitness to convey ideas. The very attempt to limit its application in the one clause, and leave it unlimited in the other, must at once excite suspicion

of doctrinal bias, or difficulties of the gravest character demanding so desperate a resort. We should not turn away from the ordinary and natural meaning of words, except when the connection or circumstances require it, and there is no necessity for any unnatural meaning to the apostle's language here. The death spoken of is physical death, or the death of the body, and the being made alive is the very opposite—it is the raising up of the bodies of those who have died. This meaning seems so natural and obvious, that Julius Müller, in his work on sin, says, "the subject is manifestly that of physical death and its dominion over the human race in contrast to the re-awakening efficiency of the Redeemer."

2. It is in harmony with the apostle's argument in this chapter. He is discussing the resurrection of Christ, and through him our own resurrection. It is the resurrection of the body that is in question. There is no reference here, as in some other places, to a moral or spiritual resurrection. If the apostle introduces this statement to illustrate and confirm the doctrine he is engaged in proving, we can see how appropriate it is. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The reasoning is conclusive. But we fail to see any fitness in the passage if it only speaks of a partial resurrection.

3. It is in full harmony with the teaching of the apostle elsewhere, and with the Scriptures throughout, on this subject. The universality of death is everywhere set before us. We meet it as a stern, solemn fact, as well as a revealed truth. In the Bible the explanation is given of this melancholy fact. "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin. In Adam all die." The resurrection of all mankind is just as clearly revealed. Paul declares, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." Jesus said, "The hour is coming, in which all that are in the grave shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

It is no real objection to say, as some have said, that in

the parallel passage in Romans, the apostle uses similar language, where a limitation must be made. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." There, as here, "all men" must be considered as including all without exception. Our translation, supplying words that are wanting in the original, makes the statement of the apostle more definite in its application than it should be. "Paul speaks," says Dr. Schaff, in Lange on Romans, "of the *objective* sufficiency and intention of Christ's *δικαίωμα* [righteousness] not of its *subjective* application to individuals, which depends upon the *λαμβάνειν* of faith, as intimated in verse 17." The limitation is not to be found in the words "*all men*," so far as the working of the offence is concerned on the one hand, nor the provisions of redemption on the other. All men are included in the offence of Adam, and all are included in the righteousness provided and offered in Christ. He died for all, because all were dead.

If the advocates of Universalism will make use of such passages to prop up their system, it is no sufficient reason why we should go to the opposite extreme, and limit the meaning of the word *all* to believers or only a part of the human family. The passage in Romans teaches the universality of sin, and the universality of grace, as this one in Corinthian does the universality of death and of the resurrection.

This then seems to be the legitimate meaning of the verse, and the meaning which the mass of common readers, as well as the great majority of learned commentators, have found. It meets every demand of a fair exegesis, and is encumbered with no such difficulties as beset other interpretations.

Here, as generally elsewhere, the simplest and most natural meaning is likely to be the true one. We are to expect hidden depths in the word of God, and should not always satisfy ourselves with what is on the surface. But we should not seek after some mysterious meaning, or profound doctrinal truths, when there is no reason to expect it. Paul addressed

watered it with blood. And, lo! a vivifying sap went up his epistles, not to philosophers and theologians, but to ordinary believers, and whilst they contain treasures of wisdom and knowledge, with some things "hard to be understood," they are open to the comprehension of plain and candid readers. No dogmatic views interpreted into this text can ever obtain general assent, or permanent hold, with the mass of the students of the divine word. They will understand "all" to include the entire human family in both cases, and the dying and being made alive to be beyond the choice or control of individuals. As it is appointed unto man once to die, so it is appointed to him to rise again and be judged.

Melvill, somewhat rhetorically it may be, but most graphically, exhibits the truth of this text in one of his sermons.

"We trench not, in the smallest degree, on the special privileges of the godly, when we assert that there is a link which unites Christ with every individual of the vast family of man, and that, in virtue of this link, the graves of the earth shall, at the last day, be rifled of their tenantry. The assertion is that of St. Paul: 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death.' Heb. 2 : 16. So that the Redeemer made himself bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; and he thus united himself with every dweller upon the globe; and, as a consequence of such union, that which he wrought out for his own flesh, he wrought out for all flesh; making, at one and the same time, and by one and the same act, his own immortal, and that of all immortal. He was then, literally, 'the Resurrection.' His resurrection was the resurrection of the nature, and the resurrection of the nature was the resurrection of all men. Oh, it is an amazing contemplation, one which even thought must fail to do justice! The first Adam just laid the blighting hand of disobedience on the root of human nature, and the countless millions of shoots, which were to spring up and cover the earth, were stricken with corruption, and could grow only to wither and decay. The second Adam nurtured the root in righteousness, and

into every, the most distant branch; and over this sap death wields no power; for the sap goes down with the branch into the bosom of the earth, and, at God's appointed time, shall quicken it afresh, and cause it to arise indestructible through eternity. It would be quite inconsistent with the resurrection of the nature—and this it is, you observe, which makes Christ 'the Resurrection'—that any individual partaking that nature, should continue forever cased up in the sepulchre. And if there never moved upon this earth beings who gave ear to the tidings of salvation; if the successive generations of mankind, without a lonely exception, laughed to scorn the proffers of mercy and forgiveness; still this desperate and unvarying infidelity would have no effect on the resurrection of the species. The bond of flesh is not to be rent by any of the acts of the most daring rebellion. And in virtue of this union, sure as that the Mediator rose, sure as that he shall return and sit, in awful pomp, on the judgment seat, so sure is it that the earth shall yet heave at every pore: and that, even had it received in deposit the bodies of none save the unrighteous and the infidel, it would give up the dust with a most faithful accuracy; so that the buried would arise, imperishable in bone and sinew; and the despisers of Christ, being of one flesh with him, must share in the resurrection of that flesh, though, not being of one spirit, they shall have no part in its glorification."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The book-business for several months has been but moderately active. Some works of much importance and permanent value have appeared, but nothing very extraordinary has marked the quarter. A large share of the publications will be seen to be reprints of English works.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—In the list of the chief issues of this class

are to be mentioned the first and second volumes of a new *Commentary*, Critical, Experimental and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments, by Rev. Drs. R. Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, published by J. B. Lippincott & Co., the first vol., containing the Pentateuch; *Murphy's Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Leviticus*, noticed in this number of the REVIEW; *The Fourth Gospel, the Heart of Christ*, by Rev. Edmund H. Sears, D. D., an able contribution to the literature concerning the life and person of Christ, from the stand-point of what is called Evangelical Unitarianism; *Christ in Modern Life*, a collection of twenty-seven Sermons, by Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, the biographer of Robertson, republished in this country by D. Appleton & Co.; *The Resurrection*, a series of able Discourses discussing this great doctrine in its relation to the truth of Christianity, by the late E. Nott, D. D.; *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, by Rev. E. A. Jacob, D. D.; *God-Man*, by Dr. L. T. Townsend, discussing, from an orthodox stand-point, the divine Manifestation, in the Person of the Mediator; another volume of *Lange's Commentary*, containing the book of *Kings*; *The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Gospels*, by B. A. Hinsdale, A. M., President of Hiram College; *On the Lord's Prayer*, by F. D. Maurice; *Humanity Immortal*, or Man tried, fallen, and redeemed, by Lawrence P. Hickok, D. D.; *Women in the Bible*, a Collection of all the Passages in the Scriptures relating to Women, with Notes Explanatory and Suggestive.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—Many works of this class have appeared. Among others, *Lectures on Instinct*. Its Office in the Animal Kingdom, and Relations to Higher Powers of Man, by P. A. Chadbourne; *Man and His Dwelling-Place*, an Essay toward the Interpretation of Nature, by James Hinton; *Ancient America*, in Notes on American Archæology, by John D. Baldwin, A. M., illustrated; *Spectrum Analysis*, in its Application to Terrestrial Substances, and the Physical Constitution of the Heavenly Bodies, Familiarly Explained, by Dr. H. Schellen, Translated by Jane and Caroline Lassell, Edited, with Notes, by Wm. Huggins, LL. D.; *Astronomy and Geology Compared*, by Lord Ormathwaite; *The Science of Wealth*, by Aurora Walker; *How the World was Peopled*, by Rev. Edward Fontaine, a series of ethnological lectures; *A Manual of the Anatomy of Vertebrated Animals*, by Prof. Thos. H. Huxley; *The Wonders of Electricity*, from the French of J. Baile; *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, by Prof. J. C. Shairp, author of the excellent volume on *Culture and Religion*, published last year; *A Dictionary of English Etymology*, an octavo vol. of 750 pages, by Hensley Wedgewood, second edition; *Unity in Variety*, a series of Arguments based on the Divine Workmanship in our planet, constitution of the human mind, and the inspired history of Religion, by George Warburton Welden, Trinity College, Cambridge; *Pre-historic Times*, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages, in the interest of the de-

velopment doctrine concerning the origin of the human race, by Sir John Lubbock; *Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1871*, Edited by Spencer F. Baird, with the assistance of eminent men of science; *Creator and Creation*, or the Knowledge of the Reason of God in His Work, by Prof. L. P. Hickok, D. D.; *A Manual of Zoology for the use of Students*, with a General Introduction on the Principles of Zoology, by Prof. H. Alleyne Nicholson; *Corals and Coral Islands*, by Prof. Dana, of Yale College; *The History of Medicine from the Earliest Ages to the Commencement of the 19th century*, by Robert Dunglison, M. D.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—Of works of this class we note the third and last volume of *Tyerman's Life and Times of John Wesley*, published by Harper & Bros.; *Notes on England*, by H. Taine, author of *English Literature*; *Lectures on the Church of Scotland*, by Dean Stanley; the third and final vol. of the *Life and Times of Lord Brougham*, written by himself; *The History of France*, from the Earliest Times to the Year 1789, by M. Guizot.

POETRY.—*The Song of the New Creation*, by Horatius Bonar, D. D.; *Within and Without*, by Geo. Macdonald; *The Masque of the Gods*, by Bayard Taylor.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Poetry and Criticism*, a new volume of Essays by Ralf Waldo Emerson; *Character Sketches*, by Norman McLeod, Editor of "Good Words;" *Laicus*, or the Experiences of a Layman in a Country Parish, by Lyman Abbott, Editor of the "Christian Weekly;" *Three Centuries of English Literature*, by John S. Hart, LL. D., of College of New Jersey; *Music and Morals*, by H. R. Haweis, published by the Harpers; *Mediæval Fables and Prophecies*, by Döllinger, edited by Prof. H. B. Smith.

GERMAN.

Christian Ethics, by Dr. H. Martensen. This work of 660 pages, is a translation from the Danish. The author, who is a Lutheran, though not of the exclusive party, is well known through his excellent work on Dogmatics. The Ethik is translated by Dr. Michelsen in Berlin, and, like all the theological works of the author, is speculative, but breathes the evangelical spirit. Our feeling of dependence on Christ is made the source of Christian morality. The difference between Catholic and Protestant morality is thus defined: the former presupposes faith in and obedience to the Church, whilst evangelical morality is a life of freedom and love created by the grace of God.

The Evangelical Faith, by Rev. F. Strehle, 500 pages. This book is intended for the laity. The author laments that in the general culture there is great lack of thoroughness, and that especially in religious matters, superficiality and ignorance are so prevalent. To give the laity a better knowledge of religion, the various doctrines are presented in a systematic but popular form. To counteract Materialism, the author discus-

ses the existence of Force, Life, Soul, and Freedom. He regards real life-communion as the most perfect relation between God and man. Love is the life of life. Christianity, as the religion of love, is the most perfect religion. The true religion is based on revelation. After the Introduction, in which the above points are discussed, the author treats first of God, secondly the doctrine of sin, thirdly the doctrine of redemption. Under the third head, Christ, the God-man, is viewed as Priest, Prophet, and King.

Strassburg in the 16th Century, by Rev. J. Rathgeber, a volume of over 400 pages, gives an account of the important part taken by this city in the Reformation.

In biography we find the following:

Rev. Wm. Hofacker, (by his son), brother of the well-known Ludwig Hofacker.

John Huss, the Reformer of the Fifteenth Century, by K. F. Koehler.

Diary of Anton Lauterbach, by J. K. Seideman. L. came to Wittenberg in 1521, and was an intimate friend of Luther. This Diary is the principal source of "Luther's Table Talk." In Luther's house and at his table Lauterbach wrote down Luther's remarks, and, in the year 1538, he collected them in this Diary. The volume, published this year, contains 270 pages.

Selected Sayings and Letters of Ulrich von Hutten, translated and edited by Dr. O. Staedel.

Besides several small volumes on the life of Luther, his stirring address *to the nobility of Germany* is reprinted. It is edited, with introduction and explanations, by Dr. F. Kuhn.

On Roman Catholicism we notice the following:

Obedience in the Society of the Jesuits, by Dr. Th. Weber.

The Election of the Popes, and the Ceremonies connected therewith, from the 11th to the 14th Century, by Dr. R. Zoepffel. A volume of 400 pages,

The Gospel and Roman Catholicism. Anonymous.

The Relation of the German Governments to the Decrees of the Vatican Council, by Prof. Dr. Hinschius.

The first part of the second volume of the *Ecclesiastical Law of Catholics and Protestants in Germany*, by the same, has also appeared.

An anonymous work entitled, *The Relation of the Church to the Tendencies of Modern Culture*, laments the fact that this culture is anti-Christian. It tends "gradually to undermine the holy ordinances of God in Church, State and Family." The author shows that culture without Christianity does not prevent moral corruption; this is proved by culture among the ancient heathen nations. Culture under the slavish direction of the Church (as illustrated by Roman Catholicism) ends in stagnation. "Only there can culture unfold its richest and most beautiful lessons, where the Spirit of the Lord, which quickens, controls the heart."

The Millennium. Against the Opponents of Scriptural Chiliasm. By A. Koch, an Evangelical Lutheran Minister in Oldenburg. The author rejects the view that the Millennium is to be ushered in by the gradual development and spread of Christianity. It is to be established by the Lord himself, and not by the efforts of his disciples. Wickedness will not gradually diminish, but will grow until the coming of Anti-Christ. The view of Hengstenberg, that the Millennium is past already, is also opposed by the author. The Lord himself is yet to come to judge the Anti-Christ. "After the destruction of Anti-Christ, those that have fallen asleep in the Lord will not rejoice in heaven above over the victory gained in the Church beneath; but they, as well as those still living on earth, shall enter upon a life of glory, in which they are to reign over the earth."

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The City of God. By Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. A New Translation. Edited by the Rev. Marcus Dobs, M. A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871. Vol. I. & II. pp. 557, 574.

We are glad of the opportunity of introducing to our readers, in an English dress, Augustine's great work—*The City of God*. Next to his *Confessions*, it is the best known and most celebrated of all the writings of this greatest of the Fathers. But until the present time it has been scarcely known to mere English readers, and it may perhaps not be a mistake to suppose that it was not very generally read in Latin even by any considerable number of educated men. Books are so multiplied, and there is so much to be read, that comparatively few will wade through a large and learned work like this in Latin. Many know more about it than they know of it.

Thanks to the enterprising publishers T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, we have now this great work in English, and it will be read by thousands. The lack of a good English translation hitherto, contrasts with its treatment among the French, and its general popularity with the learned. The English editor tells us, that "in France, this work has been a favorite for four hundred years. There may be said to be eight independent translations of it into the French tongue, though some of these are *in part* merely revisions." Its popularity at an earlier day may be judged of from the fact stated that from 1467 to the end of the fifteenth century, no less

than twenty editions were called for, or a new edition every eighteen months.

This work was begun A. D. 413, and finished A. D. 426, occupying thirteen years of Augustine's life—from his fifty-ninth to his seventy-second year—and embodies the fruits of his ripest studies and richest experience. The occasion and design are furnished by himself.

"Rome having been stormed and sacked by the Goths under Alaric their king, the worshippers of false gods, or pagans, as we commonly call them, made an attempt to attribute this calamity to the Christian religion, and began to blaspheme the true God with even more than their wonted bitterness and acerbity. It was this which kindled my zeal for the house of God, and prompted me to undertake the defence of the city of God against the charges and misrepresentations of its assailants. This work was in my hands for several years, owing to the interruptions occasioned by many other affairs which had a prior claim on my attention, and which I could not defer. However, this great undertaking was at last completed in twenty-two books. Of these, the first five refute those who fancy that the polytheistic worship is necessary in order to secure worldly prosperity, and that all these overwhelming calamities have befallen us in consequence of its prohibition. In the following five books I address myself to those who admit that such calamities have at all times attended, and will at all times attend, the human race, and that they constantly recur in forms more or less disastrous, varying only in the scenes, occasions, and persons on whom they light, but, while admitting this, maintain that the worship of the gods is advantageous for the life to come. In these ten books, then, I refute these two opinions, which are as groundless as they are antagonistic to the Christian religion.

"But that no one might have occasion to say, that though I had refuted the tenets of other men, I had omitted to establish my own, I devote to this object the second part of this work, which comprises twelve books, although I have not scrupled, as occasion offered, either to advance my own opinions in the first ten books, or to demolish the arguments of my opponent in the last twelve. Of these twelve books, the first four contain an account of the origin of these two cities—the city of God, and the city of the world. The second four treat of their history or progress; the third and last four, of their deserved destinies. And so, though all these twenty-two books refer to both cities, yet I have named them after the better city, and called them *The City of God*."

The theme was one that well fitted the mind of Augustine, and in its discussion he warms and glows with an ardor worthy of his subject. His fervid eloquence does not fail him from the opening sentence: "The glorious city of God is my theme," until after reveling amid the splendors and joys of heaven, he thoughtfully and humbly says, "Let those who think I have said too little, or those who think I have said too much, forgive me;

and let them who think I have said just enough join me in giving thanks to God."

Learned judges have united their testimony to the great ability displayed in this work, and its value when written and for all time. Gibbon, who cannot be suspected of any partiality for the author, and mentions with ill-concealed contempt his "two hundred and thirty-two separate books or treatises on theological subjects, besides a complete exposition of the Psalter and the Gospel, and a copious magazine of epistles and homilies," yet acknowledges his "personal acquaintance with the bishop of Hippo," in "*The Confessions and the City of God*." Schaff speaks of this work as "the first attempt at a comprehensive philosophy of universal history under the dualistic view of two antagonistic currents or organized forces, a kingdom of this world which is doomed to final destruction, and a kingdom of God which will last forever."

Milman's criticism is so fine and appreciative that we transfer a considerable part of it to our pages.

"The City of God was unquestionably the noblest work, both in its original design and in the fulness of its elaborate execution, which the genius of man had as yet contributed to the support of Christianity. Hitherto the Apologies had been framed to meet particular exigencies: they were either brief and pregnant statements of the Christian doctrines; refutations of prevalent calumnies; invectives against the follies and crimes of paganism; or confutations of anti-Christian works, like those of Celsus, Porphyry, or Julian, closely following their course of argument, and rarely expanding into general and comprehensive views of the great conflict. The City of God, in the first place, indeed, was designed to decide forever the one great question, which alone kept in suspense the balance between paganism and Christianity, the connection between the fall of the empire and the miseries under which the whole Roman society was groaning, with the desertion of the ancient religion of Rome. Even this part of his theme led Augustine into a full, and, if not impartial, yet far more comprehensive survey of the whole religion and philosophy of antiquity, than had been yet displayed in any Christian work. It has preserved more on some branches of these subjects than the whole surviving Latin literature. The City of God was not merely a defence, it was likewise an exposition of Christian doctrine. The last twelve books developed the whole system with a regularity and copiousness, as far as we know, never before attempted by any Christian writer. It was the first complete Christian theology.

"Augustine dedicated thirteen years to the completion of this work, which was forever to determine this solemn question, and to silence the last murmurs of expiring paganism. The City of God is at once the funeral oration of the ancient society, the gratulatory panegyric on the birth of the new. It acknowledged, it triumphed in the irrevocable fall of the Babylon of the West, the shrine of idolatry; it hailed at the same time the universal dominion which awaited the new theocratic polity. The

earthly city had undergone its predestined fate; it had passed away with all its vices and superstitions, with all its virtues and its glories (for the soul of Augustine was not dead to the noble reminiscences of Roman greatness), with its false gods and its heathen sacrifices: its doom was sealed, and forever. But in its place had arisen the City of God, the Church of Christ; a new social system had emerged from the ashes of the old; that system was founded by God, was ruled by Divine laws, and had the Divine promise of perpetuity.

"The first ten books are devoted to the question of the connection between the prosperity and the religion of Rome; five to the influence of paganism in this world; five to that in the world to come. Augustine appeals in the first five to the mercy shown by the conqueror, as the triumph of Christianity. Had the *pagan* Radagaisus taken Rome, not a life would have been spared, no place would have been sacred. The *Christian* Alaric had been checked and overawed by the sanctity of the Christian character, and his respect for his Christian brethren. He denies that worldly prosperity is an unerring sign of the Divine favor; he denies the exemption of the older Romans from disgrace and distress, and recapitulates the crimes and the calamities of their history during their worship of their ancient gods. He ascribes their former glory to their valor, their frugality, their contempt of wealth, their fortitude, and their domestic virtues; he assigns their vices, their frightful profligacy of manners, their pride, their luxury, their effeminacy, as the proximate causes of their ruin. Even in their ruin they could not forget their dissolute amusements; the theatres of Carthage were crowded with the fugitives from Rome. In the five following books he examines the pretensions of heathenism to secure felicity in the world to come; he dismisses with contempt the old popular religion, but seems to consider the philosophic Theism, the mystic Platonism of the later period, a worthier antagonist. He puts forth all his subtlety and power in refutation of these tenets.

"The last twelve books place in contrast the origin, the pretensions, the fate of the new city, that of God: he enters at large into the evidences of Christianity; he describes the sanctifying effects of the faith, but pours forth all the riches of his imagination and eloquence on the destinies of the Church at the resurrection. Augustine had no vision of the worldly power of the new city; he foresaw not the spiritual empire of Rome which would replace the new-fallen Rome of heathenism. With him the triumph of Christianity is not complete till the world itself, not merely its outward framework of society and the constitution of its kingdoms, has experienced a total change. In the description of the final kingdom of Christ, he treads his way with great dexterity and address between the grosser notions of the Millenarians, with their kingdom of earthly wealth, and power, and luxury (this he repudiates with devout abhorrence); and that finer and subtler spiritualism which is ever approaching to pantheism, and, by the

rejection of the bodily resurrection, renders the existence of the disembodied spirit too fine and impalpable for the general apprehension."

After these extended notes and criticisms from others, we need add but little ourselves. Doubtless the captious reader will find many things in these two substantial volumes that he will deem unworthy of serious attention. But we may ask: "What is the chaff to the wheat?" There are indeed many things which more than fourteen centuries have so changed our views of that we no longer care for them, or feel their application to us. But the main part of the work, like the city it describes will endure. It abounds in keen dialectics, vigorous turns of thought, striking facts and analogies, profound views of divine truth, sound Christian philosophy, and the whole is pervaded by a fervor of piety and zeal that is stimulating to study. No thoughtful mind can ponder the contents of these two substantial volumes without feeling the presence of one of the noblest of intellects and most elevated Christian characters.

Having discussed the origin of the City of God, which he refers to a period even prior to man's creation, and includes the unfallen angels, he traces its history through the creation and fall, and along the line of the development of the human race, until it reaches its consummation in the kingdom of glory above. It will be readily seen what a wide field this opens, and in traversing it Augustine has shown a profound interest, and cannot fail to instruct others who may follow him in his discussions.

Instead of pointing out what we might take exceptions to in these volumes, or dwelling upon special merits, we prefer to advise those who may feel sufficient interest to read the work for themselves. The second volume contains a copious Index of Subjects to the whole, and also an Index of Texts of Scripture referred to or explained in the work, which greatly add to its value for the purpose of reference.

For fifteen hundred years Augustine has been an inhabitant of that city which he has portrayed, and we believe that the study of his immortal work will advance its interests, and aid others in preparing to share in its privileges and blessings.

LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

42 N. Ninth St. Phila.

The Emerald. From the German of Redenbacher, by A. H. Lochman, D. D., Translator of the "Basket of Flowers." pp. 199. "The Fatherland Series."

The story of this very interesting little volume sets forth the sin and folly of *envy*. The hatefulness of the vice is brought out the more strongly by the contrast in which it is made to stand with illustrations of sweet Christian contentment, patience, and love. The translation, by Dr. Lochman, has been made in the happiest style, and it reads with the ease and naturalness of original English. A feature of excellence in the book, worthy of special note, is, that the need and power of the grace of Christ are

brought into clear view. Its teaching is thoroughly Christian and evangelical. This is specially to be prized in all books for the young, and particularly for such as are put into the Sunday School library. The book is indeed a charming one, worthy of a place in the excellent series to which it belongs, and will carry holy influences into the minds and hearts of its youthful readers.

Self-Will and Repentance. Translated from the German of Franz Hoffman, by Rev. Charles A. Smith, D. D. pp. 189. "Fatherland Series."

The story of a self-willed young man, refusing the kind and reasonable counsels of his old uncle, the Count Eberhard, but taught in the end, by bitter experience, the folly of his arbitrary stubbornness, and returning penitent, from his wanderings, to his ancestral home. The plan of the story is simple, but the adventures are highly wrought and exciting, and the warning against self-will is intensely emphasized in the lesson. The lesson, however, lacks the positively Christian element. It teaches only the natural morality of good sense and prudence. There is no grace about it. It is a picture of a returning prodigal, but he is brought back only to his uncle and to common sense—nothing more. But the lesson, even on this lower ground, is a very necessary one, and it is well to save the young from such ugly and dreadful folly as self-will, even if the reformation is not carried any further.

Both these volumes have been gotten out in the neat and substantial style, in which Mr. Shryock has published the whole Fatherland Series. In paper, printing, and binding they are models of good taste, for juvenile books. This series deserves the praise that has welcomed the appearance of the successive volumes.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Leviticus, with a new Translation. By James G. Murphy, LL. D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast, Author of Commentaries on Genesis and Exodus. pp. 318. 1872.

This volume on Leviticus possesses the same general qualities of its predecessors on Genesis and Exodus by the same author. They have taken rank among the very ablest commentaries on these portions of the sacred volume, and this new volume will not lessen the distinguished reputation of the critic and commentator. Throughout it is marked by clearness, critical judgment, and reverence for the inspired records. There is no needless display of learning, but the author's ripe scholarship is evident on every page. His aim is to give a clear view of the meaning and design of the Book. The plan of arrangement is very convenient. The amended version and the comments are placed together, the text at the head of the page. Very clear and satisfactory explanations of the general

subject are prefixed to each chapter, and the philological notes are given at the end. It is thus suited to both the learned and unlearned reader.

Whilst Leviticus furnishes less that is stirring in events, and makes less demand on the commentator to explain and harmonize its teachings with science, history, archaeology, and chronology, than do Genesis and Exodus, it is not inferior in importance to either. Indeed, in a strictly religious point of view, it is not surpassed by any other part of the Old Testament. In it, more than in any other portion of the ancient Jewish Scriptures, do we find the doctrines of atonement, pardon, and purification exhibited and illustrated.

The author's estimate of the design and value of Leviticus is thus set forth in a well written preface:

"The Book of Leviticus is the figurative exhibition of the way of salvation. It is the central book of the Pentateuch. After the history of the whole human race in relation with God given in the Book of Genesis and, the growth of the seed of Abraham into a free and holy nation recorded in the Book of Exodus, we have in this highly remarkable and singularly interesting book the first full and particular development of the way of salvation for man, in a series of symbolic forms suited to the primeval stage of the human race, and fitted to edify the infant people of God, unfold to their mind and conscience the first principles of reconciliation with God and renovation after his image, and prepare them for the coming of the substance of all these shadows in the fulness of time. Nothing can exceed the interest of this book for the age in which it made its appearance; and the attentive study of it will contribute much to the confirmation and comfort of us who live in the light of the gospel which it foreshadows, after the advent of the Mediator whom it represents.

Mr. Draper is conferring a great service on the cause of sound biblical learning by the issuing of these volumes in so attractive a style. Like most of his publications, this volume is a model of neatness in mechanical execution.

A Guide to Reading the Hebrew Text: For the use of beginners. By Rev. W. H. Vibbert, M. A., Professor of Hebrew in the Berkeley Divinity School. pp. 67. 1872.

This small volume is designed for beginners, as "a guide and help to the reading of the text of the Hebrew Bible," and especially for those who are without "the services of the living teacher." It is no new highway to master the difficulties of the language, or to supplant the use of the Grammar and Lexicon. For the purpose designed, it will be found useful. It is printed in Mr. Draper's usual neat style.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

The Wars of the Huguenots. By William Hanna, D. D., author of the *Life of Christ*, etc. pp. 344. 1872.

This is a very attractive volume, on a subject of almost tragic interest, from the graceful pen of Dr. Hanna. It consists of Lectures delivered to the members of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. The story of the Reformation in France, and of the struggles of the Huguenots, is told in graphic language. Bloody St. Bartholomew's Day, in the centre of the picture, appears in all the horrors of its stern reality. The name Huguenot is of somewhat uncertain origin, but their history is written in legible characters, and furnishes many illustrious names. This volume will possess a special interest for many American readers, as no small number of distinguished families, especially in New York, Virginia, and South Carolina, are the descendants of the Huguenots—noble descendants of a noble ancestry.

Thought-Hives. By Theodore L. Cuyler, Pastor of Lafayette Avenue Church, Brooklyn. pp. 341. 1872.

Dr. Cuyler stands at the very head of writers of short, racy, touching articles for the religious press. We have here a collection of such articles contributed to different papers, and making a volume of most interesting and instructive reading. "Many men of many minds" may find something to suit their tastes. The Doctor's own mind is a good illustration of what furnishes the title—"a moving thought-hive."

Aimee: A Tale of the days of James the Second. By Agnes Giberne. pp. 490. 1872.

This volume, by a descendant of "the old Languedoc noblesse," is designed to illustrate the experience of Protestants in France and England two centuries ago. A view of France during the latter days of Louis the Fourteenth, and of England under James the Second is presented. The scenes are vividly described, and the story made one of excitement to the reader.

Isoult Barry of Wynscote. Her Diurnal Book. A Tale of Tudor Times. By Emily Sarah Holt, author of Ashcliffe Hall, etc. pp. 524. 1872.

This tale is historical. The prominent persons are real characters. When fictitious characters are introduced the fact is noted. Unpublished manuscripts are referred to in corroboration of the statements given. We are carried back more than three centuries, and by this diary of a lady, kept in England and France, furnished with many illustrations of life in those trying times—trying times to Protestants.

Our Four Boys. By Julia A. Mathews, author of the Golden Ladder Series, Drayton Hall Series, etc. pp. 324. 1872.

This is one of the "Dare to do Right Series," and gives the experience of four boys, who passing through some rather strange adventures, show the value of daring to do right. The moral lesson is one that boys should learn.

The Cash Boy's Trust. By Annie M. Mitchell. pp. 245. 1872.

A touching story of a poor boy and his sister; the former becoming cash-boy in a large store, falsely accused, cast into prison, patiently suffering wrong until fully acquitted of all suspicion, and afterwards advanced to a position of comfort and enjoyment. It illustrates the reward of true merit, and how Providence, through poverty and suffering, often leads to honor and happiness.

Mamie's Watchword, "Thou God seest Me." By Joanna H. Mathews, author of the "Bessie Books" and the "Flowrets." pp. 233. 1872.

This is one of the "Little Sunbeam Series." It is the story of a little girl, self-willed and spoiled, taking for her watchword, "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good," and greatly improving under the divine lesson. She sought to live rather than talk her watchword.

The Happy Land. By the Author of "Lonely Lilly," etc. pp. 105. 1872.

We got Agate of Singing: or 'Jesus, Tender Shepherd, hear me.' By A. C. C. D. pp. 95. 1872.

These two little volumes belong to the "Fireside Library," and illustrate the value of Christian song, or the happy impressions often made by children singing the sweet hymns, which are so prominent in our Sunday School training. Let the children sing.

The Song of the New Creation, and Other Pieces. By Horatius Bonar, D. D., author of "Hymns of Faith and Hope." pp. 275. 1872.

This is another sweet volume from a true Christian poet. The many who have read his "Hymns of Faith and Hope," will welcome this new contribution from a favorite author. It is published in a very neat and attractive style. It affords us pleasure to commend such publications, believing that they will give pleasure and profit to the reader.

DODD & MEAD, 762 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

A Pastor's Sketches, or Conversations with Anxious Inquirers, respecting the Way of Salvation. By Ichabod S. Spencer, D. D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. A New Edition. Two volumes in one. pp. 414, 430.

These volumes were received with great favor by the religious public when they first appeared. Some of the sketches are of most thrilling interest, and illustrate the fact that truth may be stranger and more exciting than fiction. The author has shown great tact, or rather heavenly wisdom, in dealing with inquiring souls. The youthful pastor will find these volumes very suggestive to him, and the more experienced will be stimulated by reading them. We are glad to see a new edition, in a cheap and convenient form. This edition is embellished by a likeness of the faithful pastor and author.

Bible Lore. By Rev. J. Comper Gray, author of "The Class and the Desk," "Topics for Teachers," etc., etc. pp. 312.

This volume contains a popular account of many subjects in and connected with the Bible. It treats of Rare Bible Manuscripts, Ancient Versions, Celebrated Commentaries, Famous English Translations, The Authorized Version, Historical Copies and Curious Editions, Peculiar words and phrases in the Bible, Obscure Customs mentioned, Remarkable Predictions, Striking Coincidences, The Apocryphal Books, The Literary Features and Notable Places mentioned in the Bible. It furnishes much instructive matter, presented in a very readable style, and is enriched by a copious index, making reference to particular subjects convenient.

Laicus: or The Experiences of a Layman in a Country Parish. By Lyman Abbott. pp. 358. 1872.

This is a very racy volume. It embraces thirty-three chapters, or articles, touching on topics full of interest in congregational or parish life. The volume, we are told, was not made, but grew. The author commenced a series of "Letters from a Layman" in the *Christian Union*, and out of these letters grew this interesting volume. It is designed to throw light upon the question, How shall Christian faith meet the current rationalism of the day? But it throws perhaps a stronger light upon a great many of the weaknesses and follies that are too current in the Church of our age. There is nothing, however, cynical in the spirit or style of the book. We should like to know of a copy being in every parish and Sunday School Library, as well as of its being freely circulated among that class of church members that do not concern themselves much about either. Whilst it sometimes cuts sharp, the tone is so genial and pleasant that it will do good for pastors and people to read, and see themselves as Laicus sees them.

A Comparative History of Religions. By James C. Moffat, D. D.

This valuable volume was noticed in the last number of the REVIEW.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

Yesterday with Authors. By James T. Fields. pp. 352.

Nearly the whole of this book appeared, during 1871, in *The Atlantic Monthly*, in a series of papers called "Our Whispering Gallery." The Letters of Miss Mitford have been added. It consists of short and lively sketches of Pope, Thackeray, Hawthorne, Dickens, Wordsworth, and Miss Mitford—six persons so eminent in literature, that well written accounts of them are always full of interest, and we are never tired of reading of them. Mr. Fields takes his readers into his study, hung round with the portraits of distinguished authors, and in a free, conversational way, at once charming and instructive, brings us into communion with their lives,

and works. He at once infuses his own interest in his subject into his reader. His account of Thackeray is an example of most enjoyable reading. While extended and complete biographies of such writers can alone satisfy the desire for information about them, these briefer notices, sketches of character and occurrences, can never fail to delight and instruct. The volume is a most readable one, full of pleasant reminiscences, and suggestive thought.

Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada. By Clarence King. 12mo. pp. 292.

Mr. King's position, as Assistant in the corps of the Geological Survey of California has given him a chance, not only of exploring the great Sierra Nevada, but of writing a most interesting and instructive account of that grand and wonderful region. He is evidently well-fitted for this kind of work. He possesses the enthusiasm of a true explorer. He has a keen eye to see, and a graphic pen to describe the facts and experiences in such mountaineering. The book opens with a clear and striking sketch of the origin and general physical characteristics of the Sierras. Its various chapters present marvel after marvel, with which the region abounds, and give the reader lively pictures of some of the peculiar phases of California life. He will find, along with facts of science, much interesting information about the great forests, the famous trees, and the wonders of the Yosemite Valley. With the writer's enthusiasm there is mingled a lively humor, and many incidents and scenes add variety and charm to the narrative.

[For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.]

Three Books of Song. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. 16mo. pp. 204.

The public will welcome this new volume of poetry, from the foremost poet of America. The superiority of Longfellow is now acknowledged among us, and the appreciation of him in England is perhaps even higher than here. His rich, clear imagination, pure, delicate sentiment, and scholarly finish of style, make his poetical productions things of true beauty and delight.

The first book of this volume contains "Tales of a Wayside Inn: The Second Day," in the vein and manner of the volume, "The Wayside Inn," which has enjoyed such a wide popularity. The stories, seven in number, are charmingly wrought together by Prelude and Interludes, and are marked by the characteristic life and grace of Mr. Longfellow's imagination. Scarcely anything could surpass the exquisite beauty into which the legend of the Monk's vision of Christ has been cast. The second book is a poem of considerable length, entitled "Judas Maccabæus," in which the stirring deeds of that hero, and terrible end of Antiochus Epiphanes, are impressively dramatized. The third book is "A Handful of Translations." The volume is worthy of its eminent author. The publishers

have done their work well, the fine, tinted paper, and clear, open type making pages that delight the eye.

Pansies: --- For Thoughts. By Adeline D. T. Whitney, author of "Real Folks," "We Girls," etc. 16mo. pp. 111.

Mrs. Whitney's prose stories have won a great and deserved popularity. This collection of small poems, written at various times, though not of the highest order of poetry, is characterized by a beauty of thought, and depth of sentiment, that must secure it great favor. Gems of rare excellence are found in it, and the pieces are all well worthy of being gathered together and preserved in this beautiful little volume.

HOLT & WILLIAMS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets, and other Old Testament Characters. From Various Sources. By the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M. A., author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," "The Origin and Development of Religious Belief," &c. pp. 366.

This is a book of rare interest. There are few ministers and biblical students, that have not often wished for just such a collection of the suggestive and beautiful legends as they have found floating as waifs in general literature and newspapers. They are full of the poetry of oriental thought. They are rich in suggestion and illustration. They cover an immense range of biblical subjects, and form a treasure of curious interest. An incredible number of legends exist connected with the history of the Old Testament. In compiling this volume, Mr. Baring-Gould has selected those that are regarded as most interesting and most reliable. His sources were ample, and he has used them with evident discrimination and judgment. It is to be hoped that he will soon fulfil his promise to favor us with another volume containing the legends connected with the New Testament characters.

DEWITT C. LENT & CO., NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

Salads for the Solitary and the Social. By an Epicure. Redressed and Compounded with Sundry Additional Esculents, Succulents, and Condiments. Illustrated with Fifty-two Original designs by Eminent American Artists. Engraved by Bobbett and Matthews. pp. 526.

This "Salad" is a collection of choice passages of all sorts, thoughtful quaint and humorous, from the whole field of literature and life. The relish in it has been attested by the fact of an immense sale, in an earlier form, both in this country and England. It is now redressed, combined and regarnished by the author, so as to make it almost new. As a collection of choice things for literary entertainment, the volume is very rich, consisting of bright and beautiful things culled from many writers, odd sayings

and selections from odd and out-of-the-way authors, words from the sages of old, anecdotes of eminent men, all connected by links of the author's own composition, and forming a store-house of rare thought, wit and racy humor, as well as of solid, useful information. A feature worthy of special notice is the discriminating and pure taste of the author, in excluding everything low, or offensive to just moral sentiment. The book is illustrated all through with well-conceived and expressive designs, and printed on beautiful, tinted paper. It is a most charming volume for odd hours, alike to entertain and quicken thought.

Lucretius on the Nature of Things. Translated into English Verse. By Charles Frederick Johnson, with Introduction and Notes. pp. 333. 1872.

Lucretius is the poet of Positivism — not the Positivism, however of the nineteenth century, but of the century before Christ. He differs very widely from our modern Positivists, in this respect, that he put himself in opposition to the crude absurdities and superstitions of Paganism, they array themselves against the light of revelation and the claims of Christianity. In nearly all else Lucretius would answer for the poet of this school at the present time. His theory of atoms might be substituted for Huxley's protoplasms, and Darwin would find his philosophy of the Descent of Man and Natural Selection poetically set forth before the light of modern science dispelled the ignorance and prejudice of these latter days. Modern Positivism has produced nothing, in poetry, equal to the great work of Lucretius, and this does not argue well for the theory of evolution and development. We should like to see a fully developed Lucretius of the nineteenth century, just to illustrate the theory.

Lucretius has no need of any divine power or supreme intelligence to account for the origin and order of all things in nature. He bids us

"Guard against the folly to believe
That the bright light of glancing eyes were made
To see, feet knit to tapering legs to walk,
Or jointed arms to the broad shoulders hung,
On either side with ministering hands,
Were given us to serve the wants of life.
This to suppose preposterous were and would
Invert the order of effect and cause;
For members were not formed in us for use,
But, being formed, made for themselves a use."

His atoms come together to fashion the universe. The earth brings forth of herself all that lives and moves on her surface.

"To earth we justly give
The name maternal, since all spring from her."

Even the race of mortal men,

"Spring from roots deep in her teeming womb."

The process has been one of slow development and growth.

"All things on Nature's breast together hung,
In infant weakness all together grew
By gradual increase and progression slow."

Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest is well described.

"For many things harmonious must conspire,
That propagation may prolong a race—
First genial food, then mutual charms of sex.
To knit the diverse in the joys of love."

We should like to quote more to illustrate the wonderful progress of modern scientific speculation, but our limited space forbids. The translator makes no reference to previous versions of Lucretius, of which there are several in poetry and prose. He seems to have performed his task carefully and well, and has supplied a valuable Introduction and Notes. The publishers, in the finely tinted paper and beautiful print and binding, have left on their part nothing to be desired.

The Presbyterian Memorial Offering, 1870—1871. pp. 107.

This volume is chiefly statistical. It furnishes the facts and figures of the great Memorial Offering of a reunited Church. It will be valuable for reference.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M. A., Founder of the Methodists. By the Rev. L. Tyerman, author of "The Life and Times of Rev. S. Wesley, M. A., (Father of the Rev J. and C. Wesley.)" In three volumes. Vols. II. and III.

The first volume of this important work was noticed in the last number of the REVIEW. The favorable impression made by that volume, has been fully sustained by the second and third, now completing the work. It is undoubtedly the great biographical production of our times, and will lift the name of its author into an honorable prominence in this department of literature. The second volume covers the period from 1748 to 1767, and exhibits the work of the great founder of Methodism whilst in the greatest vigor of life, from his forty-fifth to his sixty-fourth year. It is the period of his most intense and successful activity, when the Methodist organization took shape and its peculiarities were determined. The exhibition of Mr. Wesley's labors, so amazing for their extent and tirelessness, reveals at once the deep spiritual energies of his character, and the forces that wrought at the origin of the great Methodist movement. The third volume continues the account from 1768, till he finished his eventful life, March 2, 1791, in his eighty-eighth year. There is something grand in the vigor with which he still worked on, and held the reins of control, through his old age. Few lives present such an illustration of earnest and tireless industry. An Appendix is added to this volume, containing an

extract from Dr. Stevens' History of Methodism, on the subject of Coke's ordination, and the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

While hyper-criticism may point out some faults in this work, they are too small to detract from the greatness and success of the author's achievement. It is marked by the three great excellences of candor, thoroughness, and clearness. The author's candor and impartiality appear in giving, with evident honesty, the errors and infirmities of Mr. Wesley, as well as his strength and glory. The things that tell most unfavorably against his wisdom and prudence, are neither concealed nor slurred over. His thoroughness is evident in the complete details given of his wonderful activity, affording all that is necessary to a full conception of the man and an understanding of his work. His style, though not perhaps of the most graceful finish, is always clear, strong, and apt.

We welcome these volumes, as a most worthy contribution to our biographical literature. Gotten out by the enterprising publishers in a very attractive and substantial style, they will be a great treasure, not only to the thousands who form the Methodist Church, but to all Christians and intelligent men, who appreciate the greatness of the movement whose origin they unfold.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments. By the Rev. Robert Jamieson, D. D., St. Paul's, Glasgow; Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M., St. Cuthbert's, York; and the Rev. David Brown, D. D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen. Vol. I. Genesis—Deuteronomy, pp. 715; Vol. II. Joshua—Esther, pp. 650. By the Rev. Robert Jamieson.

It must be regarded as a most favorable indication of the interest in the study of the Scriptures, that, besides commentaries on separate books, three such works as Lange, *The Bible or Speaker's*, and this *Critical, Experimental, and Practical Commentary*, should be issuing from the American press at the same time. Two volumes of this last one are already before the public from the large and enterprising establishment of J. B. Lippincott & Co., and the other two volumes, to complete the work, are expected soon to follow. It will probably be the first of these great works to be presented to the public in a complete form.

These two volumes are gotten out in excellent style, and we predict for the work, as it deserves, a large sale. It is what it purports to be, a *Commentary on the Bible*, and will be found the very work that many desire and need. The plan of the work is very convenient. Each volume contains an Introduction, in which are discussed the various topics of a more general character belonging to the several books contained in the volume. These Introductions are, upon the whole, very satisfactory — that in the first volume covers fifty pages, and that in the second about half this amount of space. In this edition, the text of the authorized version is

printed at the head, and the comments follow on the same page. The comments are such as the title indicates, and have been prepared with judgment and skill. Those of a critical character are largely devoted to the meaning and explanation of particular words. There are fewer long dissertations than appear in some Commentaries, but more attention to the one point of explaining the true meaning and application of the text. On some points, as the earlier accounts in Genesis, we are presented with quite ample discussions. The author seems to have availed himself of the most recent and advanced learning in this field of Biblical research. The volumes are supplied with maps of the countries which engage special attention in this part of the Bible. For all the ordinary purposes of a Commentary, this work must claim a pre-eminent position. Sunday School teachers, Bible Classes, and all students of the sacred volume, will find here a most excellent help. J. B. Lippincott & Co. deserve great credit for the neat and substantial style in which they are furnishing this valuable Commentary to the public. We shall await with interest the appearance of the other volumes.

Pliny's Letters. By the Rev. Alfred Church, M. A., Head-Master of the Royal Grammar-School, Henly-on-Thames, and the Rev. J. Brodribb, M. A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. pp. 170. 1872.

Cicero. By the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M. A., author of "Etoniana" "The Public Schools," etc. pp. 197.

Sophocles. By Clifton W. Collins, M. A., H. M., Instructor of School. pp. 181. 1872.

Messrs. Lippincott & Co. are doing an excellent service in the publication of this series of "*Ancient Classics for English Readers*," edited by Rev. W. Collins. The aim of the series is, as stated, to "explain, sufficiently for general readers, who these great writers were, and what they wrote; to give, whenever possible, some connected outline of the story which they tell, or the facts which they record, checked by the results of modern investigations; to present some of the most striking passages in approved English translations, and to illustrate them generally from modern writers; to serve, in short, as a popular retrospect of the chief literature of Greece and Rome." They are, thus, brief, but comprehensive sketches of the life and times of the writers, with examples and accounts of their works in proper places. These volumes admirably fulfil this idea. They afford even English readers a chance of becoming acquainted with the great writers of antiquity. They will be helpful to students. We cordially recommend them.

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

The Underground Rail Road. A Record of Facts, Authentic Narratives, Letters, &c., Narrating the Hardships, Hair-breath Escapes, and

Death Struggles of the Slaves in their efforts for Freedom, as related by themselves and others, or witnessed by the author; together with sketches of some of the largest stockholders, and most liberal aiders and advisers, of the road. By William Still, for many years connected with the Anti-Slavery Office in Philadelphia, and Chairman of the Acting Vigilant Committee of the Philadelphia Branch of the Underground Rail Road. Illustrated with 70 fine Engravings by Bensell, Schell and others, and Portraits from Photographs from Life. Sold only by Subscription, pp. 780. 1872.

The title of this book is so full that it leaves little to be said about it. It is doubtless the fullest record, in the language, of the adventures of slaves and the zealous efforts of their friends, in their escape from bondage to freedom. It gives an inside view of what was transpiring in the country prior to the war, and which none then would have dared to make public. As an authentic record of facts, furnished by one who was a prominent actor, it will be studied with interest. No one can read it now without astonishment, that such a system existed amid the Christian civilization of the nineteenth century, or without a sense of relief that it has passed away forever.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

Studies in Poetry and Philosophy. By J. C. Shairp, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews, author of "Culture and Religion." pp. 340. 1872.

The publication of the volume "Culture and Religion" has made the name of Professor Shairp well and honorably known in our country. This new volume from his graceful pen will receive, as it deserves, a cordial welcome. It will confirm, and still elevate, the high reputation of the author. Like the former, it is a work of surpassing merit, and happily adapted to the facts and tendencies of our times. The volume contains four essays, on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keble, and The Moral Motive Power. The first three essays give us appreciative and discriminating sketches of those great authors named, displaying deep critical insight, keen and thorough analysis, and generally just and reliable judgment. They are rich in thought and admirable in style. The author's enthusiastic admiration for Wordsworth has led him into a higher estimate of his poetry and influence than many critics will accept. The essay on the Moral Motive Power is one of rare merit. He refers to the want of interest in ethical discussions, and the inefficiency and impotence of moral theories, even the clearest and soundest. He recalls, in a most interesting way, the salient features of speculation on the subject, and brings us to the great truth that the barrenness of theories of morals can be ended only by the life and power of Christianity. Christ has introduced into the moral heart of man that which all philosophers have been unable to find — a new dy-

namic force, which not only tells them what is good, but inspires them with the love and the power of being good. He shows how a living morality roots itself back into, and grows up from the great vital doctrines of atonement, pardon, and renewal, and sharply exposes the folly of those whose cry is, "Give us Christian morality without the dogmas." Rarely do we meet with a book that so richly rewards perusal, or which better deserves a place in the library.

CLAXTON, REMSEN & HAFFELFINGER, PHILADELPHIA.

Homo versus Darwin: A Judicial Examination of Statements Recently published by Mr. Darwin regarding "The Descent of Man." pp. 155. 1872.

The author of this volume is not given. It is another arraignment of Mr. Darwin's theory of "the Descent of Man." Additional interest is imparted to the subject by the method of conducting the examination. It takes the form of a judicial proceeding, in which Mr. Darwin is allowed to plead his own cause. Of course there is some advantage on the side of the prosecution, as both sides are really exhibited by one speaker. But we think that no one can candidly read this examination without feeling that Mr. Darwin would not fare very well if his theory were subjected to such rules of evidence as would be admitted in a court of justice. Under the pretence of science it asks us to receive what is beyond the extremest credulity.

CONGREGATIONAL PUBLISHING BOARD, BOSTON.

History of the Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Sandwich Islands. By Rufus Anderson, D.D., LL. D., Late Foreign Secretary of the Board. pp. 408. Third Edition. 1872.

This is indeed the history of "a heathen nation evangelized." The very best argument for Foreign Missions is a work like this. The main facts are too well known to need repeating here. The wonderful power of the gospel, in completely transforming a people, is illustrated in this volume. Dr. Anderson has enjoyed special advantages for giving us an authentic and carefully prepared history of this wonderful triumph of divine grace over human degradation and shame, and he has furnished a work that will be referred to for authority, as well as read to stimulate our zeal in the cause of Missions to the heathen.

A. S. BARNES & CO., NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

The American Botanist and Florist: Including Lessons in the Structure, Life, and Growth of Plants; together with a Simple Analytical Flora, descriptive of the native and cultivated Plants growing in the Atlantic Division of the American Union. By Alphonso Wood, A. M.

As a Text-Book for botanical classes, we know of none that will com-

pare with this. It is simple, yet thorough, comprehensive and practical. Its new feature of *Synoptical Tables* will greatly aid both teacher and pupil.

The Education Year-Book, 1872. A Hand-book of Reference, comprising a Digest of American Public School Laws, Systems of Instruction, and interesting matter pertaining to Schools and Colleges, ranging from Professional Anecdotes to Educational Statistics. Published Annually. Vol. I.

A yearly exhibit of the progress of the educational work, such as is given in this volume, is of great value, and almost indispensable to every one who wishes to be posted on the great subject, and take a wide and intelligent view of it. Every teacher should have it.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The House of God: or Claims of Public Worship. By Rev. W. W. Evarts, D. D. With Designs and Estimates for Church Buildings pp. 132.

A reformation in Church building is needed. This little volume, with its well-written chapters, and tasteful, economical Plans, will help it on.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

Public and Parlor Readings: Prose and Poetry; For the use of Reading Clubs, and for Public and Social Entertainment Miscellaneous. Edited by Lewis B. Monroe. 16mo. pp. 352.

This volume is composed of selections, from various sources, which have proved entertaining to public audiences, or literary or social circles, or are suitable for school exhibitions, or amateur readers. It is one of the very best collections of its kind, that we have seen.

SCHULZE & GASSMAN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism, Explained in Questions and Answers, By Dr. John Conrad Dietrich, with additions from the Dresden Catechism and the Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church, and with additional proof passages from the Holy Scriptures. Together with Two Appendixes. Translated from the German edition published by the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, etc. pp. 220. 1872.

The full title page of this little volume explains sufficiently its character. We commend it to all who desire to know what, according to "the most straitest sect of our religion," genuine Lutheranism is.

A few book notices, unavoidably crowded out, will appear in the next number of the REVIEW.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.



Article.	Page.
I. THE PRINCIPLE OF THE LUTHERAN REFORMATION,...	321
By S. SPRECHER, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.	
II. THE DESCENT OF MAN,.....	346
By Rev. Prof. CYRUS THOMAS, De Soto, Ill., Ass't U. S. Geol. Survey.	
III. THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS,.....	377
By C. A. HAY, D. D., Prof. in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.	
IV. JOHN KEPLER, THE GERMAN ASTRONOMER,.....	387
Translated from the German, by Rev. C. B. THÜMMEL, Dixon, Ill.	
V. SOURCES OF POWER IN PREACHING,.....	397
By the Rev. CHAS. A. STORK, A. M., Baltimore, Md.	
VI. THE ELOQUENCE OF ST. PAUL,.....	418
By Rev. JOEL SWARTZ, D. D., Williamsport, Pa.	
VII. RECENT WORKS ON ENGLISH LITERATURE,.....	435
By Prof. E. FERRIER, of Pennsylvania College.	
VIII. EXPOSITION OF 1 COR. 15 : 22,.....	448
IX. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,.....	456
X. NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS,.....	460

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.

GERMAN.

Ethical—Evangelical—Historical.

NEW BOOKS.

The City of God—The Emerald—Self-Will and Repentance—A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Leviticus—A Guide to Reading the Hebrew Text—The Wars of the Huguenots—Thought-Hives—Aimee: A Tale of the days of James the Second—Isoult Barry of Wyncote—Our Four Boys—The Cash Boy's Trust—Mamie's Watchword, "Thou God Seest Me"—The Happy Land—We got Agate of Singing: or "Jesus, Tender Shepherd, hear Me"—The Song of the New Creation, and Other Pieces—A Pastor's Sketches, or Conversations with Anxious Inquirers, respecting the Way of Salvation—Bible Lore—Laius: or The Experiences of a Layman in a Country Parish—A Comparative History of Religions—Yesterdays with Authors—Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada—Three Books of Song—Pansies—Legends of the Patriarch's and Prophets—Salads for the Solitary and the Social—Lucretius on the Nature of Things—The Presbyterian Memorial Offering—The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley—A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments—Pliny's Letters—Cicero—Sophocles—The Underground Rail Road—Studies in Poetry and Philosophy—Homo versus Darwin—History of the Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Sandwich Islands—The American Botanist and Florist—The Education Year-Book—The House of God—Public and Parlor Readings—Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism, Explained in Questions and Answers.